



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

B. 8218.94

Harvard College Library




FROM THE GIFT OF

ALEXANDER COCHRANE

OF BOSTON

FOR BOOKS ON SCOTLAND AND
SCOTTISH LITERATURE



B 8218.94

Harvard College Library




FROM THE GIFT OF

ALEXANDER COCHRANE

OF BOSTON

FOR BOOKS ON SCOTLAND AND
SCOTTISH LITERATURE





HISTORY
OF THE
SCOTTISH CHURCH

Printed by R. & R. Clark, Limited

FOR

DAVID DOUGLAS, EDINBURGH

LONDON . . SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT AND CO., LIM.

CAMBRIDGE . . MACMILLAN AND BOWES

GLASGOW . . JAMES MACLEHOSE AND SONS

HISTORY
OF THE
SCOTTISH CHURCH

BY
W. STEPHEN
RECTOR OF ST. AUGUSTINE'S, DUNBARTON

VOL. II

EDINBURGH: DAVID DOUGLAS
1896

Br 8:10.74



*Gift of
Alexander Cochran*

PREFACE

THE author has much reason to be gratified with the criticisms of the press on the first volume of his history. His statement in the preface that he did not profess to be "colourless in his opinions," was interpreted by some critics as an admission that he had written in the spirit and with the design of a partisan. He submits that the words were susceptible of a different interpretation. The writer of Church history, who is aware of his own bias in things ecclesiastical, is the more likely to be on his guard against it, and to steer an even course between divergent lines of historical representation.

This has been his honest endeavour in the second volume as in the first. But as the modern period, now brought under review, bristles with controversial matter over which historians have disputed from the Reformation downwards, he has no very sanguine expectation that his treatment of it will escape the charge of partisanship from extreme men of any school. To succeed in satisfying such as are themselves partisans would assuredly be the clearest proof of partisanship.

The author desires to express his obligations to the Rev. George Sutherland, Portsoy, the Rev. J. C. Barry,

Dunbarton, the Rev. Canon Low, Largs, for careful revision of the MS.; and to the Rev. Canon Wilson, Edinburgh, and the Rev. J. Wiseman, Aberdeen, for no less careful correction of proofs. He has also to thank the Most Rev. Primus, Dr. Jermyn, Bishop of Brechin, for permission to examine the MS. Register College of Bishops, and for valuable assistance F. T. Barrett, Esq., Mitchell Library; Wm. Simpson, Esq., Baillie Library; W. J. S. Patterson, Esq., Stirling's Library; John Muir, Esq., the Faculty Library, all in Glasgow: also T. G. Law, Esq., Signet Library; J. T. Clark, Esq., Advocates' Library; J. Taylor Brown, Esq., Antiquaries' Library, Edinburgh; the Rev. D. H. Brown, Brechin Diocesan Library, the several diocesan synod clerks, and Mr. Joseph Craig, Dunbarton, for his services in copying the MS. of both volumes, and for aid in compiling the index.

Among many private friends whom the author has to thank for the use of their libraries, he would mention the Rev. George Grub, Ayr, for the favour of Dr. Grub's interleaved copy of the later volumes of his history. He would also place on record his indebtedness, especially in this second volume, to the work of Dr. Grub, that most learned, accurate, and conscientious of historians.

Besides a list of Authorities cited in the second volume, and the correction of several *errata* in the first, there is now added a complete index to both volumes.

ST. AUGUSTINE'S, DUNBARTON,
Whitsuntide, 1896.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

REIGN OF QUEEN MARY, 1560

	PAGE
Contrast between the Reformations in Scotland and in England—The ministry of the Scottish Reformers neither Episcopal nor Presbyterian—The first provisional Protestant Church—The first Confession of Faith, 1560—The First Book of Discipline—Knox's Book of Common Order—The ecclesiastical polity of the first Reformers—The necessity of Reformation—The lines on which it proceeded in 1560	I

CHAPTER II

REIGN OF QUEEN MARY, 1560-1562

First Protestant Council, known later as the General Assembly—The Assembly and the Romanists—Estates refuse approval of Book of Discipline—Knox's controversy with Romanists—Second Assembly and Romanists—Embassies to Queen Mary and Queen Elizabeth—Envoys to Queen Mary on her widowhood—Mary's return to Scotland—Opposition to the Mass—Queen's interview with Knox—Maitland of Lethington and Knox—Queen visits Edinburgh Castle and eastern towns—Objections to her exercise of religion—Privy Council refuses confirmation of Book of Discipline—Provision for Reformed ministry—Noblemen's seizure of Church lands—Morals of ministers and people—John Craig colleague to Knox in St. Giles'—Quintin Kennedy and Ninian Winzet withstand the Reformers—Discussion at Maybole between Kennedy and Knox	16
---	----

CHAPTER III

REIGN OF QUEEN MARY, 1562-1565

Pope Pius IV. solicits Mary to send prelates to Council of Trent—Her answer—Visit of Goudanus, papal nuncio—His interview with queen and Roman prelates—His report of religious parties in Scotland—His severe criticism on Scottish Roman prelates and priests—Rebellion of earl of Huntly—Second interview between queen and Knox—Protestant feeling against Romanists—Roman prelates and priests imprisoned for saying mass—Queen opens her first Parliament—Knox's violent language against the queen and papists generally—Third interview between Mary and Knox—Meeting of Assembly at Perth—Knox tried for illegal assembling of queen's subjects—Persecution of Romanists—Assembly presents to queen six articles praying reformation—Knox's second marriage—Queen engaged to Darnley—Their marriage . . .	PAGE 36
--	------------

CHAPTER IV

REIGN OF QUEEN MARY, 1565-1567

Rebellion of nobles—Knox abets the rebels and is summoned before the Council—Filling of vacant sees—Queen's alleged connection with a foreign League to oppress Protestants—Murder of Rizzio—Darnley's complicity—Knox leaves Edinburgh—Birth of prince James—His baptism by archbishop Hamilton—Confession of Faith by Swiss Reformers sent to Scotland—Contrast with Scottish Confession—Ecclesiastical polity of the time—Revival of the primate's consistorial jurisdiction—Divorce of Bothwell—Darnley's murder—Queen's capture by Bothwell—Their marriage—Queen's imprisonment in Lochleven—George Buchanan moderator of Assembly, 1567—Its Resolutions—Deposition of the queen—Moray made Regent . . .	53
---	----

CHAPTER V

JAMES VI.—REGENCIES OF MORAY, LENNOX, AND MAR,
1567-1573

Coronation of prince James—Prosecution of Roman Catholics—Parliament of 1567 confirms Reformation settlement and Confession

CONTENTS

ix

	PAGE
of Faith, makes provision for stipends—Assembly of 1567 deals with bishop Bothwell—Mary's escape from Lochleven—Battle of Langside—Mary a fugitive in England—Assembly's censorship of the press—Moray "reforming" Aberdeen University and burning witches—Degrading of Roman priests—Moray's plot against queen Mary—His assassination, career, and character—Lennox made regent—Meeting of Knox, Craig, and Winram, with Kirkaldy and Maitland in Edinburgh castle—Knox at St. Andrews—Capture of archbishop Hamilton in Dunbarton castle and his execution at Stirling—His character—Anomalous state of Church parties—Church lands, how they went—Erskine of Dun on the office of bishop—Convention of Leith and titular Episcopacy—Douglas made titular primate—John Knox and Episcopacy—Knox returns to Edinburgh—His last illness, death, and character—Edinburgh castle surrendered—Death of Maitland and execution of Kirkaldy—Morton regent	69

CHAPTER VI

JAMES VI.—GOVERNMENTS OF REGENT MORTON AND OF KING JAMES, 1573-1582

Morton's rule—Persecution of Romanists—Titular bishops under the Assembly—Return of Andrew Melville—Knox and Melville compared—Morton's ecclesiastical policy—His device for paying stipends—Assembly deals with Church festivals—Melville's first attack on titular Episcopate—Assembly limits bishops to particular charges—Patrick Adamson, titular archbishop—Assembly deals with Adamson and with heretics, and ministers keeping ale-houses—Lord Glamis's six questions to Beza—Beza's answers—Morals of the people in 1578—Letters from the pope to king James and to the Scots—Melville as Moderator—His influence over the Kirk—"Sang scuils"—Bassandyne Bible—Two new Court favourites, Lennox and Arran—Execution of Morton—Fresh arrival of Jesuits—Melville renews attack on titular bishops—Assembly of Dundee, 1580, condemns Episcopacy—Jesuit scare and the signing of the king's Confession—Formation of the first presbyteries—Review of ecclesiastical position—Second Book of Discipline—Montgomery, tulchan archbishop of Glasgow—Difference between titular and tulchan bishops—Death of George Buchanan	100
---	-----

CHAPTER VII

JAMES VI.—FROM 1582 TO FIRST ESTABLISHMENT OF
PRESBYTERIANISM IN 1592

PAGE

Presbyteries deal with titular bishops—Embassy from France, its reception—Ministers and the Raid of Ruthven—Visit of Brown, the English secretary—Melville escapes to Berwick—Adamson visits English bishops—Acts of Parliament 1584, "the Black Acts"—Compulsory subscription of the Acts—Adamson and Melville collide—Banished lords and fugitive ministers in London—Their return—Capture of king at Stirling—Balcanqual and the king dispute in the kirk—Mutual excommunications of Adamson and the Melvilles—Presbyterians refuse to pray for queen Mary—Scene in an Edinburgh church—Execution of queen Mary—Attempt to extrude prelates from Parliament—Act of Annexation—Spanish Armada preceded by troops of Jesuits—King James's marriage—Death of Erskine of Dun—Pont of St. Cuthbert's, bishop of Caithness—King's reputed speech in favour of Presbytery—Scots ministers favour English Puritans—Death of archbishop Adamson—Assembly of 1592 presents four Articles to Parliament—Titular Episcopacy abolished and Presbytery for the first time established—Review of ecclesiastical polity . . .

129

CHAPTER VIII

REIGN OF JAMES VI.—FROM THE FIRST ESTABLISHMENT OF
PRESBYTERIANISM IN 1592 TO THE UNION OF THE CROWNS
IN 1603

Presbyterians petition Parliament for the aid of the Civil Power—Romanists implicated in the "Spanish Blanks"—Persecution of Romanists—Argyll's defeat by Huntly in Glenlivet—The king and the Presbyterian ministers march against Huntly—The appeal of Jesuit Gordon to Romanists in Elgin cathedral—The ministers reprove the king and his Court—Andrew Melville's speech to the king at Falkland—Melville's second appearance at Falkland—Intemperate speeches of other ministers—Riot in Edinburgh—King removes court to Linlithgow—Seditious language of ministers—Calderwood's picture of Presbyterian Church in 1596—Meeting of Estates and of Assembly in Perth—King's proposals—Resolutions adopted—Assembly at Dundee—King's ecclesiastical commission and further resolutions in favour of Episcopacy—

CONTENTS

xi

	PAGE
Assembly at Montrose in 1600 completes the scheme—King's book <i>Basiliikon Doron</i> and Melville's action thereon—The Kirk and the theatre—Gowrie conspiracy—New titular bishops—Work of Assembly at Burntisland 1601—Deaths of leading ministers—King and Court remove to London	157

CHAPTER IX

JAMES VI.—FROM HIS ACCESSION TO THE ENGLISH THRONE, 1603, TO THE RESTORATION OF THE EPISCOPAL SUCCESSION IN SCOTLAND, 1610

English puritans' "Millenary Petition"—Conference at Hampton Court—More titular bishops, Spottiswoode for Glasgow—Disputed Assembly at Aberdeen—Imprisonment of ministers—Parliament at Perth repeals Annexation Act—Prelatic pomp in Perth—King sends for titular bishops and Presbyterian ministers—Andrew Melville's behaviour—Melville at Whitehall—Tyranny of king to Melville and his friends—Melville's imprisonment in the Tower and exile in Sedan—Banishment of six ministers—Assembly at Linlithgow, 1606—Parliament orders Chapter for St. Andrews—Persecution of Romanists—Consistorial Courts and two courts of High Commission restored—Decline of Presbyterianism—Gradation of Church courts—Episcopacy restored by Glasgow Assembly of 1610—Eleven Articles accepted—Imprisonment of Huntly, Angus, and Errol as papists—Spottiswoode, Lamb, and Hamilton in London—King's object to have them consecrated—Their consecration in London	183
--	-----

CHAPTER X

JAMES VI.—FROM RESTORATION OF EPISCOPAL SUCCESSION, 1610, TO THE DEATH OF THE KING, 1625

Consecration of other ten bishops—Spottiswoode alone qualified for a bishopric—Mediocrity of other bishops—King's instructions to bishops—Parliament of 1612 ratifies Episcopal Government—Bishop Cowper of Galloway—Death of prince Henry, and of David Lindsay, titular bishop of Ross—Persecution of Romanists—Execution of Ogilvie the Jesuit—Spottiswoode succeeds Gladstones in archbishopric of St. Andrews—Frequent translations of bishops—Death of marquis of Huntly—University degrees regarded as papistical—Progress of Scotland—Spottiswoode's suggested reforms—Assembly at Aberdeen, 1616—Its enactments

for liturgy, grammar schools, church registers—King's Five Articles proposed—King visits Scotland, 1617—Holds Parliament—Its enactments—Dissatisfaction of Presbyterians therewith—King's Book of Sports—Assembly at St. Andrews, 1617—King's displeasure with the bishops—Patrick Forbes, bishop of Aberdeen—Perth Assembly, 1618, accepts the King's Five Articles—More persecution of Romanists—Synod of Dort—Parliament of 1621 ratifies Perth Articles—William Forbes minister in Edinburgh, and afterwards its first bishop—Deaths of eminent Presbyterian ministers, and of James VI.	PAGE 205
--	-------------

CHAPTER. XI

CHARLES I.—FROM HIS ACCESSION, 1625, TO THE INTRODUCTION OF CANONS AND ORDINAL, 1636

King's accession and marriage—Provides stipends to bishops and ministers—Calls on nobles to restore Church lands—Settlement of teinds and of parish schools by the king—New bishops—King's purpose to restore cathedrals of Iona and St. Andrews—Religious "revival" at Stewarton under Dickson, the minister—King visits Scotland in 1633—Crowned at Holyrood—Bishop Laud—Parliament confirms Episcopal government and worship—Earl of Rothes challenges the vote—Laud's sermon—Laud visits Dunblane—"Humble supplication" to king involves lord Balmerino—His trial, condemnation, and reprieve—King on return to London orders Scottish bishops and clergy to wear vestments—Erection of bishopric of Edinburgh and its first bishop, Dr. William Forbes—St. Giles' made the cathedral—Death of Patrick Forbes, bishop of Aberdeen—His services to the University and diocese—Bishops Wedderburn of Dunblane and Maxwell of Ross—Archbishop Spottiswoode chancellor in 1635—Grounds of dissatisfaction with the appointment—King's impolitic measures—Imposing the Canons and the Ordinal, 1636—Bishop Boyd of Argyll—Samuel Rutherford relegated to Aberdeenshire—The Aberdeen "Doctors"	230
--	-----

CHAPTER XII

CHARLES I.—YEARS 1637 AND 1638—INTRODUCTION OF LITURGY AND DISESTABLISHMENT OF EPISCOPACY BY GLASGOW ASSEMBLY

Scottish Church never without a Liturgy—Liturgies before 1637—History of "Laud's Liturgy"—Its character and contents—In-

CONTENTS

xiii

	PAGE
roduction of, in July 1637—Reasons for opposition to—Riot in St. Giles’—The promoters of the riot—The mythical Jenny Geddes—Disturbance in Glasgow over Liturgy—Petitions against the Liturgy—Fresh riot in Edinburgh—The “Tables”—Their action—The National Covenant signed—Criticism of the Covenant—Demands of “Covenanters”—City of Aberdeen and the Covenant—Aberdeen “Doctors” oppose it—King sanctions his father’s Negative Confession—Two intermediary episodes—Preparations for Glasgow Assembly—Aim of Covenanters—Libel against the bishops—Meeting of Assembly in Glasgow Cathedral 1638—Its proceedings—Commissioner dissolves Assembly—It sits notwithstanding, rescinds the Acts of six previous Assemblies, condemns and deposes the bishops, abolishes Episcopacy and requests the king’s approval of its proceedings	249

CHAPTER XIII

CHARLES I.—FROM DISESTABLISHMENT OF EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN 1638 TO BEGINNING OF GREAT REBELLION, 1643

Hamilton’s report of Glasgow Assembly—His accusations against bishops—Action of Covenanters enforcing the Covenant—Beginning of civil war in Scotland—Action of Assembly in Edinburgh, 1639—Deprivation of Episcopal clergy—Fate of the bishops—Presbytery and witchcraft—Split among Covenanters—Deprivation of “Aberdeen Doctors” and clergy—Covenanting army “harries” Aberdeen—Covenanters seek military aid from French king—Covenanting army marches into England—Its leading ministers in London—Extravagant demands of Covenanters—Opening of Long Parliament, 1640—Strafford and Laud—Scottish nobles, royalist and anti-royalist—General Assembly and English Puritans—Second visit of Charles to Scotland—King powerless in Kirk and Parliament—Covenanting leaders rewarded—Rebellion in Ireland—King’s return to England—Great Rebellion—Communications to the Assembly from king and English Parliament—Divided counsels in Scotland as to the civil war—Patronage—General Assembly paramount—English Puritans attend General Assembly of 1643—They invite Covenanters to Westminster Assembly—Solemn League and Covenant framed in Scotland and signed by English Puritans at Westminster—Eight Covenanters appointed to Westminster Assembly	276
--	-----

CHAPTER XIV

CHARLES I.—FROM BEGINNING OF CIVIL WAR, 1643, TO
KING'S EXECUTION, 1649

	PAGE
Opening of Westminster Assembly—The six Scottish representatives —Publication of Directory for public worship, and suppression under penalty of Book of Common Prayer—Royalists in Scotland —Montrose's victories—His defeat at Philiphaugh—Covenanters' cruelties to prisoners—Execution of Scottish royalists—Final defeat of king's army at Naseby—Negotiations between king and Parliament—Charles seeks refuge in Scots' camp—His corre- spondence with Henderson on Church polity—Scots surrender king to English Parliament for "a consideration"—Westminster Confession of Faith in 1647, and Catechisms in 1648—Close of Westminster Assembly—King signs the "Engagement" at Carisbrook—Covenanting insurrection at Mauchline—Defeat of Scots Royalists at Preston—Cromwell in Edinburgh—Meeting of the Estates in 1649—Purging it of Malignants—Political character and power of the General Assembly—Execution of the king	295

CHAPTER XV

CHARLES II. AND THE COMMONWEALTH—FROM EXECUTION OF
CHARLES I., 1649, TO RESTORATION OF CHARLES II., 1660

Covenanters' terms with Charles II.—Execution of Huntly—Deputation visits Charles at the Hague—Their report to Assembly—Fana-
ticism of Covenanters—Montrose's last campaign, defeat, and
execution—Second deputation to Charles at Breda—His arrival
in Scotland—Cromwell's return—Defeats Scots army at Dunbar
and takes possession of Edinburgh and Glasgow—Charles's
coronation at Scone—Dissension among the Scots in Parliament
and in Assembly—Covenanters split into "Resolutioners" and
"Protesters"—Cromwell follows Scots army and defeats it at
Worcester—Monk's subjugation of Scotland—Condition of the
country after thirteen years of the Covenant—Commonwealth
established—Colonel Cotterel disperses the Assembly—Crom-
well's ecclesiastical polity—Resolutioners and Protesters before
Cromwell—Covenanting tyranny in Aberdeen—English sectaries
in Scotland—Persecution of Romanists—Death of Cromwell—
Sharp as an agent of the Resolutioners—Restoration of Charles

CONTENTS

XV

	PAGE
—Sharp's interview with king—Rescissory Act of Scots Parliament—Executions of Argyll, James Guthrie, Govan, and Warriston—The Synods and Episcopacy—King's bad faith . . .	311

CHAPTER XVI

CHARLES II.—FROM RESTORATION OF EPISCOPACY, 1661 TO 1670

<p>Policy adopted in selecting the bishops—Sharp, Fairfoul, Hamilton, and Leighton—Their history and character—Ordination of two and consecration of the four in Westminster—Welcome of the bishops in Edinburgh—Filling of other sees—Parliament ratifies establishment of Episcopal Church—Bishops take their seats in Parliament—Collation to benefices by bishops—Meeting of diocesan synods—Style of worship in Episcopal Church established—Removal of non-conforming ministers—Character of their substitutes, the "curates"—Dr. Burnet, bishop of Aberdeen—Rivalry of Middleton and Lauderdale—Middleton superseded by Rothes—Severe Act of Parliament, the "Mile Act," against outed ministers—New bishops—High Court of Commission set up—Persecution of Covenanters—Leighton's pacific policy—Gilbert Burnet, the historian—His charges against the bishops—Leighton in Dunblane—Covenanters goaded into insurrection—Fight at Rullion Green—Hanging and banishment of Covenanters—Overtures for conciliation—Attempt on the primate's life—Embitterment of Covenanters against the primate—Indulgences offered, 1667, 1669—Archbishop Burnet and the Covenanters—Burnet in trouble with Privy Council, and Sharp with the Parliament—Assertory Act—Expulsion of archbishop Burnet . . .</p>	339
---	-----

CHAPTER XVII

CHARLES II.—FROM 1670 TO THE MURDER OF ARCH- BISHOP SHARP IN 1679

<p>Leighton Commendator of Glasgow—His policy approved by the king—Holds diocesan synod in Glasgow—Visits the diocese—Confers with clergy in Edinburgh—His proposals—Appoints itinerant preachers, "the bishop's evangelists," in the west—Conferences at Paisley and Edinburgh—Causes of Leighton's failure—Act against field conventicles—Other penal Acts—Another Indulgence, 1672—Leighton archbishop of Glasgow, 1672—Dean Ramsay of</p>

Glasgow bishop of Dunblane—Leighton's resignation refused by king—Resigns next year and retires to Sussex—His death in 1684—Archbishop Burnet restored to Glasgow, 1674—Gilbert Burnet resigns professorship—Bishops agitate for national synod—Sharp opposes and rebukes bishop Ramsay—Covenanters' meetings—Their hatred of Sharp—Fresh persecutions—Lauderdale's "Highland Host" in the west—Mitchell's trial and execution for attempt on Sharp's life—Murder of the archbishop—His character and career	PAGE 366
--	-------------

CHAPTER XVIII

CHARLES II.—FROM 1679 TO THE KING'S DEATH IN 1685

The Covenanters at Rutherglen—Graham of Claverhouse—Skirmish at Drumclog—Insurrection of Covenanters—Battle of Bothwell Brig—Fate of prisoners—Archbishop Burnet primate, and Ross archbishop of Glasgow—Indemnity Act, the fourth Indulgence—Queensferry and Sanquhar Declarations—Cameron and Cargill leading Covenanters—Fight at Airds Moss—Execution of two women in Edinburgh—John Gibb and his sect—Duke of York's visit and "no popery" riot—Test and Succession Acts—Argyll condemned—Escapes to Holland—Episcopalians oppose Test Act—Quakers persecuted—Parson Gordon of Banchory as a reformer—Death of bishop Scougal—William Carstares and others involved in Rye-house plot—His torture in Edinburgh—Severer measures against Covenanters—Renwick defies the Government—Deaths of leading ecclesiastics and statesmen—Death of the king	385
--	-----

CHAPTER XIX

REIGN OF JAMES VII., 1685-1689

New Act of Indemnity—Claverhouse in the West—Shooting of John Brown—The Wigton Martyrs—Parliament renews Test Act and penalties against Conventicles—Execution of Argyll—Covenanters in Dunnottar Castle—King favours Romanists—Sets up Roman Catholic worship in Holyrood—Deprivation of bishops for opposing king—Enlarged Indulgence—Capture and execution of Renwick, the last martyr for the Covenants—Retrospect of the persecutions—Imprisonment of seven English bishops—The king's flight and the arrival of William of Orange—Bishop Rose

CONTENTS

xvii

	PAGE
of Edinburgh in London—His interview with English bishops and with prince William—His rejection of William's advances—Rabbling of Episcopal clergy in the west—William and Mary accepted as sovereigns by English Convention and by Scottish—Revolution Settlement—Episcopacy abolished—Battle of Killiecrankie and death of Claverhouse, viscount Dundee—Presbyterianism established—New patronage Act—The Scottish bishops responsible for the disestablishment of Episcopal Church	398

CHAPTER XX

REIGN OF WILLIAM III. AND MARY, 1689-1702

Jacobitism of Episcopal Church—Representative ecclesiastics since Reformation—Carstares and the Presbyterian Establishment—Relative numbers of Episcopalians and Presbyterians at Revolution—Classes and districts favourable to Episcopacy—First Assembly for thirty-seven years—Its component members and legislation—Assembly receives king's letter and welcomes three Cameronian ministers—Opposition of Covenanters to Assembly—Lawrence Charteris on national sins—Presbytery filling vacant charges—Opposition to Presbyterian ministers—Glenorchy as an example—Episcopalians remonstrate with the king against Presbyterian intolerance—King's reply—Assembly refuses to tolerate Episcopal clergy—Glencoe massacre—Persecution of Episcopalians, Quakers, Romanists—Oaths of Allegiance and Assurance—Threatened mutiny of ministers before Assembly of 1694—Carstares intercepts king's despatches—Opposition of Episcopal clergy to Presbyterian Commission—Consecration of bishop Nicolson 1695, first Scoto-Roman bishop since Reformation—Number of Scottish Romanists—Ministry of Episcopal clergy forbidden—Indulgence offered them—Execution of Aikenhead—Witches again prominent—Parliamentary Act for parish schools 1696—Barrier Act—Rabbling Act—Heresy of Madame Bourignon—King William's death—His public administration and private character	419
---	-----

CHAPTER XXI

REIGN OF QUEEN ANNE, 1702-1714

Act of Settlement—Politics of Episcopal clergy—Rabbling of Episcopal clergy—Their petitions to the queen—Higher claims
--

	PAGE
by Assembly of 1703—Scottish Parliament, 1703—Intolerance of Assembly's Commission—Death of archbishop Ross, the last primate, 1704—Deference of bishops to royal prerogative—Consecration of bishops—Bishop Sage—Treaty of Union, 1707—Terms of Treaty—Carstares and the Union—Bishops Campbell and Gadderar—The Assembly on public worship, psalmody, and penny weddings—Episcopalians use English Prayer Book—Opposition of Presbyterians to its use—Greenshields' case—Rabbling of Presbyterian ministers—Rabbling of Episcopal ministers—Toleration Act, 1712—Presbyterians oppose toleration—History of patronage—Patronage Act, 1712—Christmas vacation Act for Law Courts—Abjuration Oath—Jurants and non-jurants—Public protestation of "M'Millanites"—Assembly of 1714 memorialise the queen on popery and prelacy—Death of queen Anne—Chief events of her reign	451

CHAPTER XXII

REIGN OF GEORGE I., 1714-1727

Political parties on king's accession—Death and character of Carstares—Earl of Mar and insurrection of 1715—Battle of Sheriffmuir—Arrival of prince James, "the Chevalier," and his departure—Execution of Jacobite leaders—Suppression of Episcopal worship by penal statute, 1719—"Qualified" chapels and ministers—Assembly's flattery of king George—Non-jurors seek union with Eastern Church—Professor Simson's heresies and trials—Auchterarder "Creed"—Marrow controversy—The Erskines—Rival bishops—Death of bishop Rose, 1720—Wranglings of diocesan and college bishops—Bishop Campbell's action—Gadderar bishop of Aberdeen—Battle of the "Usages"—Bishops Cant, Rattray, Keith—Edinburgh presbyters protest against college system—More bishops and more wrangling—Persecution of Roman Catholics—Their numbers	476
--	-----

CHAPTER XXIII

REIGN OF GEORGE II., 1727-1760

Concordat between diocesan and College bishops—Assignment of dioceses—Deposition of John Glass—Formation of "Glassites" or "Sandemanians"—Wodrow the historian—Patronage disturbs Presbyterian Church—Riding Committees—Ebenezer Erskine
--

	PAGE
opposes patronage, and is censured by Assembly—Erskine and other three ministers deposed—Formation of "The Associate Presbytery" in 1733—Sympathy with Seceders—Their growth into "Associate Synod"—Preaching of Whitfield—His quarrel with Seceders—Whitfield returns to Scotland, 1742—Preaches at the Cambuslang revival—Death of Gadderar—His work and policy—Death of Rattray—His literary works—Episcopal Synod, 1743, and its code of canons—Protest of Edinburgh presbyters—Effects of persecution upon Episcopalians and Roman Catholics—Jansenism among Scottish Romanists—Prince Charles Edward and the insurrection of 1745—Renewed persecution of Episcopalians—Severity of penal statutes, 1746 and 1748—Penal statutes against Roman Catholics—Seceders separate into Burghers and Anti-Burghers—John Wesley's visit—Small stipends and patronage in Established Church—Deposition of Gillespie and formation of "The Presbytery of Relief," 1761—Assembly deals with David Hume and John Home—Reflections on life and morals of the period.	498

CHAPTER XXIV

GEORGE III.—FROM BEGINNING OF HIS REIGN, 1760, TO REPEAL OF PENAL STATUTES, 1792

Episcopal worship and administration under persecution—Penal statutes not rigidly enforced under George III.—Elections of bishops—Primus Falconer succeeded by Kilgour, with John Skinner as coadjutor—The Scottish Communion Office—Literary activity in the Universities, <i>e.g.</i> Principals Robertson and Campbell, Professors Reid, Beattie, Blair, etc.—Grievance of patronage in the Established Church—Disputed settlements of ministers—Creed subscription questioned—Opposition of Presbyterians to Roman Catholic Relief Bill—Bishop Hay leader of Romanists—Suppression of Jesuit Order in 1773—Disabilities of Romanists in Scotland—Attempt to relieve them frustrated by Scottish fanaticism—Burke's criticism thereon—Robertson's retiral from Church affairs in 1780—The "Buchanites"—Consecration of bishop Seabury, 1784—Primus Skinner—Bishop Abernethy Drummond—Heresy of Dr. M'Gill—Seceders condemn Erastian Establishment and sound first note of Voluntarism—Death of Charles Edward, 1788—Episcopalians transfer allegiance to Hanoverian dynasty and seek relief from penal statutes—Relief Bill in 1792—Effects of a century's persecution on Episcopal Church	528
---	-----

CHAPTER XXV

FROM REPEAL OF PENAL LAWS, 1792, TO DEATH OF
GEORGE III., 1820

Primus Skinner's report to convention at Laurencekirk—Acceptance of Thirty-nine Articles—Bishop Jolly—Union of "qualified" clergy with Episcopal Church—Election of Dr. Sandford as bishop of Edinburgh—Roman Catholic Relief Bill, 1793—Bishop Hay's influence on Roman Mission—Established Church plants Chapels of Ease—Moderates and Popular party in the Establishment—Their gradual divergence—Foreign Missions discountenanced in Assembly of 1796—Home Missions by the Haldanes aided by Simeon and Rowland Hill—Ferment from their preaching—Low ebb of religion in Scotland—Character of Presbyterian worship—Haldanes become Congregationalists and finally Baptists—Burghers and Anti-Burghers divide into New and Old Lights—Contest between Moderates and Evangelicals on pluralities—Bishops Torry and Gleig—Attempt to enforce Scottish Office—Episcopal synod restricts presbyters to rubrics—General Synod of 1811—Poverty of clergy—Regium Donum to Episcopalians—Parliamentary annuity to Presbyterians—Death of Primus Skinner and his services—Election of bishops William Skinner and David Low—Death of George III.

PAGE

554

CHAPTER XXVI

GEORGE IV., 1820-1830, AND WILLIAM IV., 1830-1837

George Fourth visits Scotland—Bishops' address to king—Bishop Hobart on bishop Jolly—Bishop Hobart and dean Skinner on lay co-operation—English clergy in Edinburgh attack Episcopal Church—Episcopal synod on the subject—Dr. Walker's use of Anglican Liturgy in Rome—Dr. Luscombe's consecration for Episcopalians on Continent—Plurality of offices in Presbyterian Church—Dr. Andrew Thomson and Dr. Chalmers oppose pluralities—First Foreign Mission from Scotland by Assembly in 1824—General Synod at Laurencekirk in 1828—Another at Edinburgh in 1829—Their legislation contrasted—Death of bishop Sandford and election of Dr. Walker for Edinburgh—Franchise to Roman Catholics in 1829—Increase of Roman Catholics in Scotland—Reputed heresies of M^rLeod Campbell and of Edward Irving—Their trial and deposition—Irvingite Church founded—

CONTENTS

xxi

	PAGE
Wider influence of Campbell's teaching—Controversy on patronage, 1832—Chapels of Ease—The Veto Act, 1834—Auchterarder Case—Attitude of Episcopal Church during Presbyterian Agitations—Effects of the Oxford Movement on Episcopal Church .	577

CHAPTER XXVII

QUEEN VICTORIA : PERIOD 1837-1857

<p>Bishops Moir and Russell consecrated—Death and character of bishop Jolly—General Synod 1838—Church Society instituted—Deaths of bishops Gleig and Walker—Their literary work—Disability Bill of 1840—Founding of Trinity college, Glenalmond—Queen's first visit to Scotland—Drummond and Dunbar schisms—Bishop Gillis and the Scoto-Roman Church—Borthwick heresy case—Deposition of Morrison by Seceders and formation of Evangelical Union—Debate in Assembly 1839 on non-intrusion—Effects of Dr. Chalmers's motion—Union of Old Light Burghers with Established Church—Lethendy case—Marnoch case—Interdicts from Court of Session—Appeal to House of Lords—Debates in Assembly—Non-intrusion agitation—Bills before Parliament on patronage—Disruption 1843—Free Church of Scotland—Action of the two Assemblies—United Presbyterian Church formed—Old Light Anti-Burghers join Free Church—Endowment of Argyll and Isles—Consecration of bishops Ewing and Forbes—And of bishop Trower—Palmer and Eastern Church—Gorham case—Bishop Torry's Prayer Book—St. Ninian's cathedral—Papal aggression—Mr. Gladstone's letter on Lay Question—Election of bishop Wordsworth—Death of primus Skinner .</p>	601
--	-----

CHAPTER XXVIII

QUEEN VICTORIA : PERIOD 1857-1875

<p>Eucharistic controversy—Trials of Mr. Cheyne and of bishop Forbes—Resignation of bishop Trower—General Synod of 1862-63—Its reforming canons—Clerical Disability Bill, 1864—Dr. Lee's liturgic reforms—Debate in General Assembly—Second debate in Assembly—Victory to Dr. Lee—Church Service Society and Scottish Church Society—Discussions on Union between the Presbyterian and Episcopal Churches, by dean Ramsay and Drs. Lee and Rorison—Union negotiations between the Free and United Presbyterian Churches—Union of the Reformed Presby-</p>

terian with Free Church—Proposals for Union of the Established and Free Churches—Laymen's league—Three Pan-Anglican conferences—Death of bishop Ewing—His characteristics—Foreign Mission schemes of Episcopal Church—Death of bishop Forbes—His literary work and influence	PAGE 638
--	-------------

CHAPTER XXIX

QUEEN VICTORIA: PERIOD 1875-1895

Bishop Jermyn of Brechin—The Lay Question—General Synod 1876, Formation of Representative Church Council—Cathedrals of Inverness, Cumbrae, and Edinburgh—Discord in Glasgow Roman mission—Erection of Roman hierarchy in Scotland 1878—Indifference of Presbyterians and the Press to Roman advance—Protest by Scottish bishops—Theological change in Presbyterian churches—Trials for "heresies": in the U. P. Church, the Ferguson and Macrae cases; in Established Church, <i>Scotch Sermons</i> , Macfarlane case; and in Free Church, professors Robertson Smith, Dodds, Bruce, and Drummond—Bishop Seabury centenary in Aberdeen, 1884—Canon Liddon's election for see of Edinburgh—His reason for refusal—General Synod, 1890—Bishop Wordsworth's death—His advocacy of Ecclesiastical Union—Recent progress of Scottish Episcopacy—Changes in public worship, both Presbyterian and Episcopal, in theological thought, in religious habits of the people—Growth of scepticism and secularism, an additional incentive to Ecclesiastical Union	662
---	-----

CHAPTER I

REIGN OF QUEEN MARY, 1560

Contrast between the Reformations in Scotland and in England—The ministry of the Scottish Reformers neither Episcopal nor Presbyterian—The first provisional Protestant Church—The first Confession of Faith, 1560—The First Book of Discipline—Knox's Book of Common Order—The ecclesiastical polity of the first Reformers—The necessity of Reformation—The lines on which it proceeded in 1560.

THE abolition of the papal jurisdiction by the Parliament of August 1560 was the crisis of the Reformation in Scotland. For some years before and after this date the reforming movement was at work; but the Act of Parliament marks the dividing line. The Anglican Church had renounced the supremacy of the pope about twenty years earlier, and the connection which had lasted for nearly a thousand years between England and Rome was then finally severed. For about half this period the Scottish Church had been subject to the Papal See, and more Roman in character than the Anglican Church. England was sufficiently strong to resist the encroachments of the papacy upon its rights and liberties, and often asserted its independence; Scotland, as the weaker country, was less able to resist the pressure of the Papal See.

What the condition of the Scottish Church was at the

VOL. II B

close of its connection with Rome has already been told. The sudden and complete collapse of the old hierarchy, without so much as a word spoken or a blow delivered in its defence, shows how thoroughly the Church was undermined by abuses and corruption. No other explanation can account for a religious revolution unequalled in our ecclesiastical annals.

The Reformations in Scotland and in England present few features in common. In England the movement was earlier ; and English statesmen rendered no small service to the Reformers in Scotland. Indeed, without aid, moral and material, from queen Elizabeth and her advisers, the Scottish Reformation would not have been accomplished in the year 1560. Again, the English Reformation owed its first impulse to the sovereign Henry VIII. The movement in Scotland was, from beginning to end, largely the work of the Scottish nobles. No impartial historian will vouch that the motives of the sovereign in the one case, or of the nobles in the other, were above suspicion. But if the Church had not been ripe for reform in both countries, the movement, like others that preceded it, would have proved abortive. Even the papal see, by the disciplinary canons of the Council of Trent, admitted the necessity of reform.

In another respect the reforming policy of the two kingdoms presents a marked contrast. In England there was no break in the ministerial succession. The English Act of 1543 speaks of establishing "a form of pure and sincere teaching agreeable to God's Word, and the true doctrine of the Catholic and Apostolic Church." With few exceptions, said to be less than two per cent, the clergy continued their offices in the reformed Catholic Church of England, and the bishops exercised their functions of ordination and government after the rejection of

papal supremacy exactly as they had done before. Not until the year 1570, when pope Pius V. published his deposing Bull, did the Roman See set up a separate communion. The historic continuity was with the National Church and not with the Roman schism, which historically formed the first dissenting community in England.

In Scotland the Reformation, almost of necessity, took a different shape. On the one hand, the old hierarchy was by parliamentary statute swept away; on the other, by silence and inaction, cowardly or compulsory, as the case may have been, the bishops virtually abdicated their place in the national Church. The ministerial continuity was broken, and restored in name only, not in substance, under the titular episcopate. Some of the Roman bishops, as will be seen, attempted desultory action for a few years, and occasionally exercised their functions, but their efforts were isolated and futile.

The ministry set up by the Reformers was an entirely new creation, professing no historic connection with the past, disowning even the laying on of hands, the outward act of ordination. The new system was not Episcopal, for it parted with the episcopate; it was not Presbyterian, not being based on parity, but on disparity of rank and office. It was a provisional Protestant Church which might as readily have developed into Episcopacy as into Presbytery, and as a matter of fact it oscillated for a time between the two. For its future shape as a Presbyterian Church in 1592 it was indebted to the political combinations of the time and the energy of Andrew Melville. Maitland of Lethington, the leading layman of the first Reformation, laboured strenuously, as much on political as on ecclesiastical grounds, to have Episcopacy established in Scotland as it was in England, in order to secure a permanent alliance between the two

countries. This alliance was his leading object after the crisis of 1560; but the fanaticism of his reforming allies, headed by Knox, and the untoward political complications of the time, baffled even the diplomatic skill of Maitland.

In its attitude towards the Roman Church, the new religion, transitional in character, was Protestant to the core. For a creed, it framed the First Confession of Faith; for a form of ecclesiastical polity, the First Book of Discipline; and for a Liturgy, Knox's Book of Common Order, commonly known as the Order of Geneva.

The Confession of Faith was the recognised standard of the Protestant Church from 1560 to 1647, when it was superseded by the Westminster Confession, more Calvinistic and rigid in doctrine. The First Confession was compiled by six well-known Reformers who all bore the Christian name of John,—Winram, Knox, Spottiswoode, Willock, Row, and Douglas, rector of the University of St. Andrews, the last adding his name after its compilation. It consists of twenty-five chapters, setting forth first, the evangelical doctrines as to God's own Being and His relations to man, and then describing the Catholic Church as containing the elect of all nations, and being an invisible body, known only to God. The notes of the visible Church are the preaching of the Word, the right ministration of the sacraments, and ecclesiastical discipline faithfully administered. Controversies as to the faith are to be settled by authority of Scripture alone; and the decrees of General Councils are to be received with caution. Touching Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which are declared to be the only sacraments of the Church, censure is passed upon such as affirm that they are nothing but naked and bare signs.¹

¹ Knox, *Hist.* pp. 252-272; Grub, ii. 89, 91.

The moderation of the Confession is remarkable considering the controversial alembic out of which it came, and the theological temperament of the age. It owed something of its conciliatory tone to Winram, who had a hand also in archbishop Hamilton's Catechism, and has thus left the marks of his moderation upon both productions, the last of the old vintage and the first of the new.¹

The same compilers prepared the First Book of Discipline, which was completed in May 1560, and submitted to a Convention of nobles at Edinburgh in January 1561. It met with a different reception from the Confession of Faith. Many of the nobles were ready to sign Confessions, but were not prepared to accept a code of discipline which sought, among other objects, to restore the Church properties to the Reformed. There were present at the Convention thirty-three barons and ex-prelates, several of whom subscribed the Book of Discipline, but with the significant proviso that bishops, abbots, priors, and other prelates and beneficed persons who had joined "the Congregation," the name now adopted by the Reformed, should enjoy their ecclesiastical revenues during their lifetime on condition of assisting to maintain the new Protestant ministry. The vested interests of the old hierarchy were thus secured, though its officials had ceased to discharge any clerical duties; but the ministers of the new religion were left in a condition of respectable beggary.²

¹ This has exposed Winram to the charge of trimming made by some writers (see Principal Lee, *Hist. Ch. Scot.* i. 32, 88-90). So highly did Edward Irving esteem the First Confession on its own merits, and still more in comparison with the Westminster Confession, that he read

it twice a year to his congregation in London.

² Spottiswoode, *Hist.* i. 373, remarks that the pledge to sustain the ministers "turned to no effect, for the churchmen that were popish took presently a course to make away all the manses, glebes, tithes, and all

The Book of Discipline is divided into nine heads.¹ The first treats of doctrine and the preaching of the gospel, by which is meant the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. The festivals of the Church, including Christmas, Easter, etc., as also Saints' days and fasting days are "utterly abolished from this realm"; and it affirms further that "the obstinate maintainers and teachers of such abominations ought not to escape the punishment of the civil magistrate."

The second head relates to the two sacraments,—Baptism, in which water only is to be used (to the exclusion of salt, etc.) and the Lord's Supper, in which sitting at the table is prescribed after the example of Christ and His disciples.² The Order of Geneva, it proceeds to say, which now is used in some of our churches, is sufficient to instruct the diligent reader how both these sacraments may be rightly administered; but further instructions are added, deviations from which "ought to be severely punished."

The third head concerns "the abolishing of idolatry," and required "abbeys, chapels, monkeries, friaries, nunneries, chantries, cathedral churches, canonries, colleges, other than such as are presently parish churches or schools, to be utterly suppressed in all places of this realm; palaces, mansions, and dwelling-houses, with their orchards and gardens, only excepted." In short, the Reformers preserved the mansion-houses of the estates

other rents possessed by them; and most of those that subscribed (the Book of Discipline), getting into their hands the possessions of the Church, could never be induced to part therewith, and turned greater enemies in that point of church patrimony than were the papists or any other whatsoever."

¹ Spottiswoode, *Hist.* i. 331-371, gives it at length.

² As a matter of posture, Christ and His Apostles neither sat nor knelt, but reclined at the last Supper, after the custom of the Jews of that day.

and the manses of the clergy, while they suppressed the buildings that served no other end but the honour of God.¹

The fourth head concerns ministers and their lawful election. Ordinary vocation is declared to consist in election, examination, and admission. Election is to be made by the people within forty days; examination by the Church as to the life and learning of the persons presented and their acquaintance with current controversies; admission is to be made in open audience when some special minister shall preach a sermon upon the duty and office of ministers. Then follow the memorable words: "Other ceremonies than the public approbation of the people, and the declaration of the chief minister that the person there presented is appointed to serve that church, we cannot approve; for albeit the apostles used the imposition of hands, yet seeing the miracle is ceased, the using of the ceremony we judge not to be necessary."²

The fifth head makes provision for ministers and for the distribution of the rents and possessions of the Church. Remuneration is to be made in different proportions according to the ministerial rank of superintendent, minister, and reader. Provision is also made for the poor, and for the support of teachers. In every parish there is to be a schoolmaster; and in notable towns, specially in the towns of the superintendents, a college is to be erected, in which "the arts of logic and rhetoric, with the tongues, shall be taught by sufficient masters,

¹ On the Petition of the Assembly, the Estates appointed several noblemen in different parts to carry out its instructions by demolishing the buildings. Spottiswoode, *Hist.* i. 372, records "the pitiful vastation" that followed. It is useless to plead in the face of this order that the Pro-

testant Church had no hand in the destruction of ecclesiastical buildings.

² A considerable number, what proportion it is impossible now to say, of the Protestant ministers had been priests of the Catholic Church, and may be supposed to have carried with them the virtue of their orders.

for whom honest stipends must be appointed." The educational scheme includes the three Universities, for which enactments are made to secure their efficiency. Altogether it was a creditable conception, devised with prudent foresight into the educational wants of the age. One thing only was wanted to make it effective—possession of the Church's patrimony; and upon that the reforming nobles and gentry kept a firm grip. The superintendents were to be ten in number, and set over so many "dioceses." Seven of the old see cities were designated as their residences, and three new ones were added—Edinburgh, Jedburgh, and Dumfries. The superintendent was to move from place to place in his diocese for the planting of churches, and for frequent preaching. He required no formal ordination, and was "subject to the censure and correction of the ministers and elders of his chief town and whole province over which he is appointed"; and if found negligent in any duty, "he must be deposed without any respect to his person or office."

In the sixth head it is enacted that the rents and patrimony of the Church shall be apportioned to the preachers, to the poor, and to schools. The reforming laymen had, however, anticipated the reforming preachers by seizing the lion's share of the Church's properties. Upon this topic the latter make the following caustic remark: "To our grief we hear that some gentlemen are now more rigorous in exacting the tithes and other duties paid before to the Church than ever the papists were, and so the tyranny of priests is turned into the tyranny of lord or laird." Yet the Reformers did not abate one jot of the ancient claim upon the tithes, and they are enumerated under this sixth head as specifically as in the mediæval statutes.

The seventh head is "concerning the censuring of offenders." The powers of excommunication wielded by the Mediæval Church lose none of their rigour in the hands of the Reformers. "The minister, by consent of the elders and deacons, and at commandment of the church, shall pronounce the offender excommunicated from God, and from the society of his church. After which sentence no person may have any kind of communication with him (his wife and family only excepted) in eating, drinking, buying, selling, saluting, or conferring with him, unless the same be licensed by the ministry." This was a tolerably comprehensive excommunication for a Church not many months old, and only wanted the "bell, book, and candles" to make it identical in form, as it was in substance, with the old "cursing." It was identical also in this, that intimation of the sentence was to be made "through the whole realm, lest any should pretend ignorance of the same."

The eighth head, concerning elders and deacons, requires that they shall be appointed yearly, on the 1st August, "lest men by long continuance in those offices presume upon the liberty of the Church." The elders are "to have an eye not only upon the morals of the people, but upon the life, manners, diligence, and study of their ministers; and if he be worthy of admonition, they must admonish him; if of correction, they must correct him; and if he be worthy of deposition, they, with the consent of the Church and superintendent, may depose him."

The ninth head concerns "the policy" of the Kirk, which is explained to be of two sorts; the one utterly necessary, That the Word be truly preached, the sacraments rightly ministered, and common prayers publicly made; the other not necessary but profitable, That psalms be sung, and the Scriptures read when there is no

sermon. In great towns it recommends sermon or common prayer daily, with some exercise of reading the Scriptures. The sermon must be preached before noon, and the children catechised in the afternoon. The Lord's Supper is to be administered quarterly, on the first "Sundays"¹ of March, June, September, and December, "that the superstitious observation of times may be avoided." None are to be admitted to communion "who cannot formally say the Lord's Prayer and the Articles of Belief, and declare the sum of the Law." "In a reformed Kirk marriage ought not to be privately used, but in open face and public audience of the Kirk, and therefore we esteem Sunday before sermon the most convenient time for celebration of marriage." Under the head of burial it is enjoined that there be neither singing, reading, nor praying over, or for the dead; funeral sermons are also discountenanced as "nourishing superstition," and tempting ministers to the respect of persons. The compilers recommend the severest punishment of such as profess to administer the sacraments without the Reformers' sanction. "Now men are so bold as without all vocation to minister the sacraments in open assemblies; and some persons presume to do it in houses without all reverence, where there is neither minister nor Word preached. Our desire is that some strict punishment be inflicted upon such abusers; which albeit we will not take upon us to prescribe, yet we fear not to affirm that both of them deserve death."

There was little that they did fear to affirm, but it is disappointing to find that they were so ready with the sentence of death upon every one who ventured to act independently of their order. Religious liberty was evidently not born in that day, nor in that school.

¹ Sunday is the word used in the Book of Discipline. Sabbath came later. See Hessey's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 269.

In the Book of Discipline there are several references to what is called "our Book of Common Order," or "the Order of Geneva which is now used," it says, "in some of our kirks." This book was compiled by Knox and his friends in Geneva, adopted by the congregation under his ministry there, and published in the year 1556. It was substantially the same as the Book afterwards introduced into Scotland which came to be known as Knox's Liturgy. A new edition was issued in 1562, and the Assembly enjoined "that an uniform order should be kept in administration of the sacraments, solemnisation of marriage, etc., according to the kirk of Geneva." Later enactments were made to the same effect by the Assembly, and, at their instance, the book was, in 1567, translated into Gaelic by John Carswell, superintendent of Argyll and the Isles,—the first work published in the Gaelic language. It has been said that the Service Book was only for the use of the "reader" in the absence of the minister; but it is expressly ordered that the minister shall use it, and the form for administering the Lord's Supper could not have been used by the reader.

The service was severely simple. It began with a confession of sin read from the book by the minister alone; then a psalm was sung, followed by an extempore prayer for a blessing on the word to be preached. Next came the sermon, and after it the prayer prescribed for the whole state of Christ's Church, ending with the Lord's Prayer. The Apostles' Creed was repeated, another psalm sung, and the service closed with the benediction. Kneeling was the posture used during confession and prayer, and standing was the attitude of praise. The psalms were sung from the English metrical version to well-known tunes, and were joined in heartily by the people. There were daily prayers and week-day sermons

in cities. On Sundays the first service was at 8 A.M. ; in the afternoon Calvin's Catechism was taught to the young. The Service Book contained forms for the administration of the sacraments. Baptism was administered in Church, the Apostles' Creed was recited, and, in the father's absence, the godfather took the sponsorial vows. In the ministration of the Lord's Supper there was a prayer for grace to the communicants, but none for 'a blessing on the elements. Portions of Scripture were read while the elements were passed from hand to hand by the recipients in their seats. After all had received, the hundred and third psalm was sung, the benediction was pronounced, and so the service ended.

The celebration was commonly early in the morning, and was to be provided four times a year in towns, and twice in country parishes. This was the usage prescribed and partly followed, but the bad tradition of the single communion at Easter in the pre-Reformation Church was too strong to be rooted out. Before the death of Knox, the rule was inoperative. In some districts yearly communion was kept up with difficulty, and in others years elapsed without any celebration. There was a form of service for the election of superintendents, and also for marriage. A prayer was provided for visitation of the sick, but no service, no prayer, and no reading of Scripture was permitted at the burial of the dead. On that occasion the protest against popery was made as strong as a silent interment could make it.

A notice of Knox's Book would be incomplete without a reference to the Order of Excommunication which was added in 1567, when the Reformers were in full power. It was based upon as lofty a claim to the divine authority of the Protestant ministry as was ever made by prelate or priest, as the following extract shows :

"We give over into the hands of the devil this fore-named obstinate contemner N——, and that not only for the crime he hath committed, but much rather for his proud contempt and intolerable rebellion. And his sin we bind ; and pronounce the same to be bound in heaven and earth. We further give over into the hands of the devil the said N——, to the destruction of his flesh, straightway charging all that profess the Lord Jesus . . . to repute and hold the said N—— accursed," etc. (pp. 166, 167). There is not much to choose between this and the mediæval excommunications.

Such was the Book of Common Order which, after a sleep of nearly three centuries, has been twice reprinted within recent years, not for congregational use, but for the edification of ecclesiastical students. The book has not the elements required for a satisfactory form of public worship. Without spiritual unction it was more a directory or guide, than a living manual—warm with the breath of the devotional spirit. Besides, its models as well as its language were chosen more from the Old Testament than the New, and failed to express the tenderness and charity of the Gospel. In all probability it was more owing to this lack of devotional fitness than to the reactionary spirit of a later age that the book ceased to keep its place in the public worship of the nation. Had its prayers been such as to take hold of the people's minds, and touch their hearts, they would not have allowed it so readily to fall into abeyance. "In England," as Dr. Robert Lee has observed,¹ "thousands, as well as king Charles, were ready to peril everything for the Book of Common Prayer ; but in favour of Knox's Liturgy, which was commonly read in our churches some sixty, seventy, or eighty years, no one stands up to speak a word ; it is allowed to perish without

¹ *Reform of the Church of Scotland*, p. 164.

a sigh ; and it is buried, as itself appointed the dead should be, without solemnity or ceremony.”¹

The above detailed account has been given of the first Confession of Faith, the first Book of Discipline, and the Book of Common Order, in view of the importance of a proper understanding of the creed, the polity, and the worship of the first Protestant Church in Scotland. It has been a debatable question whether that Church was Episcopal or Presbyterian in polity. Most readers will come to the conclusion that it was neither the one nor the other. It had peculiarities common to both, but historically and in principle it belongs to neither. Presbytery, as a form of church government and polity, came from Geneva to Scotland for the first time in 1592, and Episcopacy, though not a stranger in the land, was practically reintroduced from England. The Protestant Church polity from 1560 to 1572 was, as has been already remarked, a provisional institution that had some features in common with Presbyterianism, namely, the calling of ministers and the ordering of elders and deacons ; and other features that were akin to Episcopacy, such as the nominal three orders of superintendent, minister, and reader, the liturgy for worship and for the administration of the sacraments. The polity was of a hybrid order, and survived but a dozen years. Its troubled and turbulent history, until it developed into titular Episcopacy, equally transient and unsatisfactory, presents so few commendable features that not much credit can accrue to either party from its paternity.

¹ James Gordon, parson of Rothiemay, in his *History of Scots Affairs*, iii. 250, records that in the year 1640, when he wrote, the set forms of prayer were being discontinued, “the Lord’s Prayer likewise began to grow out of fashion as a set

form, and the Gloria Patri, used in the Church since the Reformation, began to fall into desuetude ; and not long after this the saying of the Creed at baptisms. . . . Finally, whatever the bishops had established, it was their work to demolish.”

The reformation of the Church was a moral necessity for the preservation of religion in the land. Romanism was rotten to the core, and no reformation was then practicable under the Roman obedience. But the Church might have been, and ought to have been reformed, without so great a breach in her historic continuity and orders; and without the loss of other things which if not essential to her being are admittedly conducive to her well-being. The Historic Episcopate was lost, and with it the three-fold ministry dating from the earliest antiquity, the weekly celebrations of the Holy Eucharist, the recurring fasts and festivals of the Christian year ordered on the model of the Life of Christ, hallowed as they had been by the usage of many centuries and some of them, like the Easter-tide, reaching back to the very roots of Christian antiquity,—all these were alike despised and rejected.¹ Scotland had broken not only with Roman mediævalism but with the early British and Celtic Church, the Church of St. Ninian and St. Kentigern, the Church of St. Columba and St. Cuthbert. She had departed wholly from the lines of the country's past ecclesiastical history.² This transitional Church in Scotland could claim organic affinity with no system of religion that had hitherto prevailed in Christendom. What the practical result was of this vital change in the religious polity of the Scottish people has to be traced in the history that remains to be told.

¹ Dr. Skelton remarks in his life of *Mailland of Lethington*, ii. 70: "I see no reason to doubt that the reformation (even in Scotland) might have been successfully conducted on other lines; that a real reform of abuses, moral and spiritual, might have been brought about without the sacrifice of intellectual breadth and veracity, of moderation, of com-

prehension, of Christian charity."

² The same author, in his *Mary Stuart*, pp. 64, 65, remarking on the line taken in Scotland at the Reformation says: "Knox was undoubtedly guilty of a fatal mistake when he cut himself off from historical Christianity, and, in his own words, 'established the Church of Christ *de novo*.'"

CHAPTER II

REIGN OF QUEEN MARY, 1560-1562

First Protestant Council, known later as the General Assembly—The Assembly and the Romanists—Estates refuse approval of Book of Discipline—Knox's controversy with Romanists—Second Assembly and Romanists—Embassies to Queen Mary and Queen Elizabeth—Envoys to Queen Mary on her widowhood—Mary's return to Scotland—Opposition to the Mass—Queen's interview with Knox—Maitland of Lethington and Knox—Queen visits Edinburgh Castle and eastern towns—Objections to her exercise of religion—Privy Council refuses confirmation of Book of Discipline—Provision for Reformed ministry—Noblemen's seizure of Church lands—Morals of ministers and people—John Craig colleague to Knox in St. Giles'—Quintin Kennedy and Ninian Winzet withstand the Reformers—Discussion at Maybole between Kennedy and Knox.

THE Protestants held their first ecclesiastical council in St. Mary Magdalene's Church, Cowgate, Edinburgh, on the 20th December 1560. It was attended by forty-two members, of whom only six were ministers—Knox, Goodman, Row, Lindsay, Harlaw, and Christison, and one superintendent, Erskine of Dun. At some subsequent meetings the members were still fewer, an indication of the limited influence as yet possessed by the Reformers, and probably of the indifference of their supporters. The council came to be known as the General Assembly, and at first met twice in the year, in the months of June and December. In the latter month it met about Christmas, on purpose to mark their disregard for that festival. In

the first six Assemblies there was no moderator; but in the seventh, which was held at Christmas 1563, they elected John Willock, superintendent of Glasgow, to that office. As yet there were neither presbyteries nor synods, nothing between the kirk-sessions and the Assembly.

The Assembly of Christmas 1560 sat as "the ministers and commissioners of the particular kirks of Scotland, convened upon the things which are to set forward God's glory and the weal of His kirk in this realm." Part of the business was to sanction the appointment of men to the several offices of superintendent, minister, and reader,—the threefold grade of the Protestant polity.¹ A resolution was passed to destroy the collegiate church, now serving as the parish church of Restalrig, near Edinburgh, as a monument of idolatry. The concealed object was to strike a blow at its dean, John Sinclair, one of the sturdiest opponents of the Reformers. A resolution was also passed to reform the laws of marriage as affected by consanguinity, relieving the country from the restrictions and costs of the canon law, which had hitherto been worked for the benefit of the Roman exchequer, and to the injury of the people's morals.

In several parts of Scotland the Romanists still held meetings and occasional celebrations of the mass. The Assembly, on the 27th December 1560, petitioned Parliament to punish them sharply as idolaters. The districts named included Ayrshire and Galloway. The earls of Eglinton and Cassillis, the abbot of Crossraguel, and the prior of Whithorn were singled out as encouraging and protecting the papists.²

¹ The scheme comprised ten superintendents for so many "dioceses"; but M'Crie (*Life of Knox*, ii. 7) says, "owing to the scarcity of proper persons, or rather to the

want of necessary funds, there were never more than six appointed."

² *Book of the Universal Kirk*, part i. p. 5.

A Convention of the Estates was held in Edinburgh on 15th January 1561, and to this Convention the Book of Discipline was submitted for approval as mentioned in the previous chapter. The Estates declined to accept it as a body; but thirty-three nobles and ex-prelates signed it, the latter securing by its provisions a confirmation of their life interests in the ecclesiastical properties they held. No importance was attached to the signing of it, and little credit was placed in the sincerity of the signatories.¹

While the nobles had no liking for discipline, they displayed some taste for theological controversy in citing several members of the Roman Church to answer for their faith. Among those cited were Alexander Anderson, Principal of King's College, Aberdeen, and John Leslie, Official of that diocese. Knox, Willock, and Goodman conducted the argument on the Protestant side. Both Knox and Leslie have recorded the discussions, and each claims the victory for his own cause. Knox relates that Anderson affirmed that only Christ could offer the propitiatory sacrifice, and that priests offered the memorial of it; whereupon he was confronted with a missal, the teaching of which contradicted him. Leslie was then asked to explain his faith, but he made answer, according to Knox, that where the master (Anderson) had nothing to say, he would not venture to speak, as he knew nothing but canon law. Knox's account, disfigured by a vulgar attack on Leslie's parentage as "a priest's bastard," gives a very different version of the affair from that of Leslie, who says of Knox that he had "an unbridled licentiousness in speaking, mixed with a virulent fluency of words." He represents Anderson as having argued with such

¹ Tytler, *Hist.* v. 46; Cunningham, *Hist. Ch. of Scot.* i. 370; Burton, *Hist.* iv. 35.

learning and ability on the true merits of the sacrifice of the altar that the Protestants could not gainsay him, while the faith of the Catholics was greatly confirmed by his defence. Knox takes credit, to which he is quite entitled, for the freedom with which the Protestants invited their opponents to discuss the differences between them. But, as is usual with such debates, they were fruitless of conviction to either side.¹

On the 27th May 1561, the second Assembly met in the Tolbooth, Edinburgh. It sent a petition to the Privy Council representing that "the pestilent generation of Anti-Christ" were again rearing their monuments of idolatry, and it called upon the Council to issue an order for the complete demolition of all existing religious houses. The Estates, at their meeting in the same month, agreed to the petition, and issued an order accordingly which probably completed the ruin that "the rascal multitude" had begun.²

One thing was still wanting to give validity to the Acts of Parliament which had revolutionised the religious system of the country, namely, the consent of the sovereign. To obtain this Sir James Sandilands, prior of the Knights of St. John, had been despatched to France after the Parliament of August 1560, which accepted the Confession of Faith.³ A more imposing legation, consisting of the earls of Glencairn and Morton, and Maitland of Lethington, was at the same time despatched to the English Court. Queen Mary and her uncle, the cardinal

¹ Knox, ii. 138-142; Leslie, book x. p. 530; Keith's *Affairs*, iii. 31-33.

² See M'Crie's *Life of Knox*, i. 435, for the letter of lord James Stewart, the prior, to the lairds whom he commissioned to purge Dunkeld Cathedral. M'Crie belittles

the destruction that followed the order of the Council. Spottiswoode, who lived near the time, gives a very different account. See his *Hist.* i. 372, 373.

³ Teulet, *Relations Politiques*, etc., avec l'Ecosse, ii. 147; *Papiers d'Etat*, i. 610-620.

of Lorraine, took offence at the want of respect shown by her subjects in sending a solitary gentleman of secondary rank as envoy to their own sovereign, while three leading statesmen had been deputed to the Court of Elizabeth. The cardinal also lectured the envoy upon his accepting such a post, seeing he was head of an ecclesiastical military order and bound by his vows to defend the Church. The queen deemed it an additional insult that the envoy was a churchman married in breach of his vows. A married prior, she said, was no prior at all. The only result of the knight's mission was to arouse the jealousy of the young queen against her cousin Elizabeth, and to increase her resentment against the dominant faction in Scotland. Mary declined to confirm their acts, and peremptorily refused to ratify the Treaty of Edinburgh, which would have excluded herself and her issue from the English throne.¹

The situation was soon changed by the death of king Francis at Orleans, 5th December 1560. Mary, queen of France for sixteen months, now a young widow and childless, had no further claim on the French people, and her thoughts naturally turned to her native land. Her subjects were eager to welcome her home, for they were wearied of regencies; and the reports of Mary's beauty and accomplishments had already won for her a place in their hearts. Very soon, early in 1561, John Leslie, the Official of Aberdeen, sailing from that port, and lord James Stewart, the prior (*il Bastardo di Scotia*), posting through England, were on their way to the widowed queen. Leslie was sent by the northern earls, who were opposed to the ruling faction in Edinburgh. Lord James represented the latter, and was deputed as their envoy to tender to the queen their allegiance and duty. Leslie beat his

¹ Tytler, *Hist. Scot.* v. 149-154.

rival by a day, and had an interview with Mary at Vitry, in Champagne, in which he warned her against her half-brother, lord James, who was a pensioner of the English Court, and therefore not to be trusted. He advised the queen to detain him in France until after her settlement among her subjects in Scotland, and further recommended her to disembark at Aberdeen, where the northern earls were ready with an army of twenty thousand men to escort her to Edinburgh. Leslie was right in his estimate of the lay prior, as Mary afterwards found to her cost ; but she wisely declined to follow his advice and commit herself as a partisan, at the commencement of her reign, to any one faction in the State. It would be her aim, she said, as it was her desire, to be sovereign of all her subjects.

On the following day, the 15th April, Mary received her half-brother at St. Dizier with all her natural frankness. He pressed her to acquiesce in the Treaty of Edinburgh, no doubt in the interests of the English Court ; but on this subject Mary remained firm to the end of her life. She is said to have urged him to break with the Reformers, and to return to the Roman Church, holding out inducements, and going so far as to promise him a cardinal's hat. While resisting her blandishments, he did not preserve the ordinary reticence of an envoy, but abused his sister's confidence by reporting their conversation to Throckmorton, the English ambassador in France, who communicated it to Elizabeth, with the information that the queen of Scots was speedily to return to her native land.¹

On the 14th August 1561, Mary embarked at Calais. She kept her tearful eyes on the fading coast of France, and had her bed made on deck that she might see it again in the morning, with a dim presentiment, it may

¹ Tytler, *Hist. Scot.* v. 174-182 ; Skelton's *Mary Stuart*, p. 29.

be, that she was leaving behind her not France only but happiness. Froude describes her at this juncture as "the brave woman, scarcely more than a girl, who was about to throw herself alone into the midst of the most turbulent people in Europe, fresh emerged out of revolution, and loitering in the very rear of civilisation."¹ Mary escaped the English cruisers, thanks to a prevailing mist, and reached Leith after a voyage of six days. Knox drew an evil omen from the friendly fog, and regarded it as a prognostication of coming judgments.²

The young queen was received with many demonstrations of loyalty by her subjects. They were rejoiced to have her in the midst of them, and she reciprocated warmly the expressions of their devotion. In a very few days the clouds began to gather. Sunday came, and preparations were made in the private chapel of Holyrood for a celebration of mass. As soon as this was known outside a noisy crowd burst into the courtyard, headed by the Master of Lindsay, sword in hand, and shouting, "The idolatrous priests shall die the death." When the mob pressed for entrance into the chapel, lord James placed himself at the door and told them gravely that it was not seemly that their eyes should see the abominable thing. Three of the queen's uncles and a small retinue of servants had accompanied her, and the latter were so alarmed by the aspect of the crowd that they begged to be allowed to return to France, seeing that liberty of worship was denied them in Scotland.³

¹ *Hist. Eng.* vi. 519. The English historian's opinion of the Scotland of that day is confirmed by Dr. R. Chambers, who says in his *Domestic Annals of Scotland*, i. 5, "It is forced upon us that the Scots were at this very time a fearfully rude and ignorant people." See also Skelton's *Mary Stuart*, chap. ii.

² *Hist. Reformation*, book iv.

³ See letter from Randolph to Throckmorton in Laing's edition of Knox, vi. 127-129; and letter in Latin from Knox to Calvin, dated Edinburgh, 24th Oct. 1561, in Teulet, *Relations Politiques*, ii. 172, 173.

Next day the queen, with the sanction of the Privy Council, issued a proclamation declaring her intention shortly to summon the Estates, to advise with them on matters of religion, promising that, meanwhile, no alteration should be made in the established order, and demanding that no molestation should be offered to her servants.¹ It was as fair a compromise as could have been offered,—liberty of conscience to both sides. But that was not the liberty for which the Reformers now clamoured. Liberty with them meant the power to put down by pains and penalties the religious liberties of others. The earl of Arran, eldest son of the duke of Chatelherault, a hot-headed youth now verging on insanity, who had aspired to Elizabeth's hand, and afterwards sought Mary's, publicly protested, after the manner of the Scots, against the terms of the proclamation, and declared in his protestation that the queen's servants were no more to be tolerated in idolatry than they should be if guilty of murder, "for the one is much more abominable and odious in the sight of God than the other."² Knox applauded the "boldness" of Arran, and relates how, next Sunday in St. Giles', he inveighed against idolatry, declaring that one mass was more fearful to him than if ten thousand armed enemies were landed to suppress the whole religion. He adds that the members of the Court present at the sermon mocked at his professed alarm, and told him that they did not share it, that it was quite beside his text, and a very untimely admonition.

Mary must have often heard of Knox, and probably liked him as little as Elizabeth did, but she had not hitherto met him. Rumours of his sermon reached the

¹ Proclamation given in Knox's *Hist. Ref.* book iv., and in Keith's *Affairs*, iii. 40.

² Knox, *Hist. Ref.* book iv.; Keith's *Affairs*, iii. 41.

palace, and she sent for him ; not, it may be supposed, with any sanguine idea of converting him, but with the reasonable hope of mollifying the angry man and bringing him to an amicable concordat of live and let live. It was a memorable meeting between the widowed queen, in her nineteenth year, with charms to which not even Knox was insensible, and the bearded Reformer, plain of speech, blunt in manner, uncompromising in terms. The lord James was the only witness, and Knox the only reporter of the interview. Mary began by accusing the preacher of stirring up her subjects against her, as he had done against her mother, and referred to his treatise against the Government of Women. Knox answered that preaching against idolatry was not sedition, and as for his book, which he said was written specially against Mary of England, though an Englishman had professed to answer it, he considered himself better able to sustain what he had written than any ten men in Europe were to refute it. But you say, replied the queen, that I have no authority. Knox would neither admit nor deny her authority. He remarked that for himself he would be as content to live under her majesty if she did not persecute the saints of God, as Paul was to live under the emperor Nero. It was not a flattering comparison to make between the girlish queen and one of the greatest monsters of pagan history ; but it was Knox's way. It has been said in his defence that he was not a courtier. True ; but he might have been civil, if he could not be courteous.

Knox was then charged with teaching the people another religion than their princes allowed ; and how, asked the queen, can that doctrine be of God, seeing that God commandeth subjects to obey their princes ? Religion, he replied, did not come from princes but from

God only, and subjects were not bound to frame their religion according to the appetites of their princes, else Abraham would have been of Pharaoh's religion, Daniel of Nebuchadnezzar's, and the apostles of the Roman emperors'. But, said the queen, none of these men raised the sword against their princes. That was only because they had not the power, said Knox. But if they have the power, do you think, said she, that they may resist their princes? The Reformer replied that the power of princes was not more sacred than the authority of a parent, and as a father in a fit of frenzy may have the sword taken from him and be bound in prison till his frenzy be overpast, so with princes whose blind zeal is nothing but a mad frenzy. The sword should be taken from them and they be cast into prison till they be brought to a sober mind; that agreeth, said Knox, with the word of God.

Mary stood amazed and silent, as Knox relates, for a quarter of an hour. Her countenance changed, and lord James thought she was ill. At length she found speech to say that she perceived her subjects were to obey Knox, and not her. Knox deprecated this interpretation of his words, and urged the queen to prove herself a nursing mother of the Church, and to nourish it. "Yes," said Mary, "but ye are not the Church that I will nourish; I will defend the Church of Rome, for I think it is the true Church of God." Knox thereupon vilified the Church of Rome as the Roman harlot, guilty of spiritual fornication, and so on. Mary said her conscience was not so; and she was told that conscience required knowledge, and that of right knowledge she had but little. Still, however, the queen held her ground, and replied that she had both heard and read. So, said Knox, had the Jews who crucified Christ. But, retorted Mary, the

pope and cardinals interpret Scripture one way and you another ; whom shall I believe? She was told that she was to believe only the Word of God, and Knox thereupon entered on a discussion of the doctrine of the mass, when Mary interrupted him by the remark that he was over-hard upon her, but that if some were present whom she had heard they would have answered him. Knox then expressed his readiness to meet the most learned papist in Europe, a wish which the queen said he might have gratified sooner than he thought.

So ended the discussion, after which the queen was called to dinner, but not before she heard Knox's parting prayer that she might be as blessed within the commonwealth of Scotland as ever Deborah was in the commonwealth of Israel. What Knox said of the queen behind her back he has also reported : " If there be not in her a proud mind, a crafty wit, and a hardened heart against God and his truth, my judgment faileth me." ¹

A new Privy Council was formed in September 1561, of which several of the Roman Catholic nobles were members. It was Mary's judicious policy to steer an even course between the opposing factions so as to secure peace for the country, if she could not promote good-will among her subjects. Her rule during the few years preceding her marriage with Darnley was so far successful that the country enjoyed an unusual measure of prosperity. Lord James was a leading member of the Council, and shortly afterwards (1562) he married the daughter of the earl Marischal, was made earl of Mar, and by and by earl of Moray. The dominating power in the Council, now and for some years to come, was the Secretary,

¹ Knox, *Hist. Ref.* book iv. Burton, *Hist.* iv. 31, remarks upon the interview : " Throughout the whole dialogue Knox does not yield

the faintest shred of liberty of conscience, or leave it for one moment doubtful that the queen has any other course before her than submission."

Maitland of Lethington. For the ten years between 1560 and 1570, the two ruling spirits in Scotland were Maitland and Knox; the one ruling the civil, the other the ecclesiastical, polity of the country, but with civil and ecclesiastical frequently overlapping and producing strained relations and bitter encounters between the two men. Knox was perfervid and sometimes abusive; Maitland always cool and often sarcastic. The Secretary's unwearied aim was to bring about a better understanding with England; a working concordat, political and ecclesiastical, between the two kingdoms; and in this object he was aided for a time by the lord James. This policy was acceptable to neither of the extreme factions at home. The Roman Catholics dreaded the effect of English influence upon the religion of the queen, and the Protestants, equally suspicious of its influence upon their religion, began now to denounce the Anglican Church as heartily as they had abused the Roman.¹

The queen in the same September made her first public entrance into Edinburgh, for which the magistrates had made costly preparations. Amidst a display of mimic pageantry, in which the citizens ingeniously exhibited their Protestantism as well as their loyalty, Mary, followed by many of the nobility, rode forth under a canopy borne by sixteen of "the maist honest burghers," from Holyrood Palace to the castle, where she dined. On her return her progress was arrested at several stages by various dramatic scenes, and among others, by a boy emerging from a cloud as a cherub, and handing to her Majesty the keys of the city, a Bible, and a psalm-book.² It was also intended to represent the burning of a priest in the act of offering the mass, but the earl of Huntly prevented the indecency. Instead of this, the destruction

¹ See Tytler, *Hist. Scot.* v. 212.

² *I.e.* Knox's Liturgy.

of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram was represented, and both parties were satisfied, as each interpreted the final scene as the appropriate reward of the other's pretensions.

In this month of September the queen visited in turn the towns of Linlithgow (her birthplace), Stirling, Perth, Dundee, and St. Andrews. Lord James had promised that she should be protected in the use of her own religious rites; but during this progress the Protestants made an outcry that by attending mass the queen had polluted the places with her idolatry. The same objection was taken to a celebration of mass after her return in the private chapel at Holyrood on All Saints' day. A meeting of "the Congregation" was held at the house of Macgill, the lord Clerk Register, where the question was warmly debated, "whether subjects might put to their hand to suppress the idolatry of their prince." The ministers were unanimous for suppression, and declared that the queen's liberty would be their thralldom; but the laymen, headed by lord James and Maitland, carried a resolution "that the queen should have her religion free in her own chapel" for herself and her household.¹

The next Assembly, held in December 1561, was marked by the absence of the reforming barons; who began to question the lawfulness of ecclesiastical meetings without the sovereign's writ.² The Assembly asked the Privy Council to confirm the Book of Discipline, a proposal which was again declined; it also petitioned the Council to suppress idolatry, and to make permanent provision for the maintenance of the Protestant ministry. This last request was deemed reasonable, excepting, as Tytler observes, by the reforming barons "who had been zealous supporters of the Reformation, but loved its plunder better than its principles." The Council never-

¹ Burton, *Hist.* iv. 34.

² Tytler, *Hist.* v. 208.

theless agreed that one-third of all ecclesiastical revenues should be divided between the ministers and the Crown, the other two-thirds remaining with the former beneficiaries. A sixth portion of the wealth of the old Church would no doubt have sufficed for the ministers of that time, but from dilapidations and waste, and fraud in making the returns, the actual sum received was a very inadequate pittance.¹

When the rent-rolls of all the benefices were made up, the third was found to be 73,880 pounds Scots,² the one-half of which should have been assigned to the Protestant ministers, and the other half reserved for the Crown ; but the reforming barons who had the distribution of the ministers' portion were determined that they should not, like their predecessors, be spoiled by affluence, and the sum actually divided among the several superintendents, ministers, and readers, in graded proportions, amounted to no more than 24,231 pounds Scots.³ The ministers cried out that they were being starved. They were told that they were better off than many a poor laird, and that the queen could not afford any more. This reference to the queen was scarcely generous, for the share that fell to the Crown was the smallest fraction of any, barely sufficient, as Maitland put it, to buy a pair of slippers for her Majesty. In many cases the third was remitted, and in many more payment of it was refused by the beneficiary. The lord James drew the whole of the large revenues of the priories of St. Andrews and Pittenweem without any deduction ; and the same was done by the earl of Argyll, lord Erskine, and other reforming lords in regard to the lands and tithes of which they had robbed the Church.⁴ The

¹ Tytler, *Hist.* v. 209.

Keith, *Affairs*, etc. App. to vol. iii. pp. 360-392.

² Pounds Scots, divided by twelve, equal pounds sterling.

⁴ Keith, *Affairs*, iii. 385.

³ The authority for these figures is

Roman bishops and prelates kept as much as they could, and their ecclesiastical possessions were converted into family heritages, temporal lordships in some cases being created in their favour out of the old church lands. They had already alienated much by permanent leases and feus, and the pope had given his confirmation to some of the questionable transactions in the hope of securing a future provision for the Roman Church. In other cases what fraud could not do, force was able to accomplish. The earl of Cassillis cast an envious eye on the abbey lands of Glenluce. The abbot was cozened into an agreement to convey the lands to the earl, but before the deed was signed the abbot died, and a monk was bribed to forge the transference. To prevent the monk from revealing the forgery the earl had him murdered. By a more barbarous device he afterwards (1571) secured the abbacy of Crossraguel.¹ Having decoyed the abbot to his castle of Dunure he roasted him over a slow fire until he was fain to sign the legal conveyance of the abbey lands in order to save his life, though he was maimed and crippled for the rest of his days. The abbot appealed to the Privy Council, but all the satisfaction he got out of the villainous earl was a small pension from the abbey lands.²

Before the Assembly of June 1562, many cases of discipline were brought up, and accusations were made by the superintendents against ministers, and by ministers in return against the superintendents. The ministers were not as yet a numerous body. In 1572, throughout the whole of Scotland, which contained nearly a thousand parishes, there were only 252 ministers, though they had

¹ This was after the death of abbot Kennedy his relative.

² *Historical and Genealogical Ac-*

count of the Family of Kennedy, Pitcairn (Bannatyne Club), pp. 91-101.

been numerous enough in 1562 to furnish a plentiful crop of scandals. The morals of the laity were not much better, judging from the testimony of Knox who, writing in the year 1564, says "the preachers were wondrous vehement in reprehension of all manner of vice, which *then began to abound*." Evidently the country was not improving in morals under Protestant discipline.¹

By the same Assembly, John Craig was appointed colleague to Knox in St. Giles' church. He was an eminent man, and with a somewhat remarkable history before settling in Edinburgh. Educated in St. Andrews, he had joined the Dominican Order, was suspected of heresy, and thrown into prison. After clearing himself of the charge, he went first to England, and afterwards to Italy, where he gained the favour of cardinal Pole. He was then for some time employed in honourable services for his Order in Bologna and elsewhere, until a perusal of Calvin's Institutes revived his doubts as to the old faith. Expressing his mind too freely, he was delated for heresy, and sent to Rome, where, after an imprisonment of nine months, he was sentenced by the Inquisition to be burned on the 19th August 1559. On the evening preceding, pope Paul IV. died, and the Romans, from dislike of his tyrannical rule, arose in revolt, attacked the Inquisition, liberated the prisoners, and set fire to the prison. Craig then made his way, after many adventures, to Vienna where he enjoyed the friendship of the archduke Maximilian. From Vienna he returned to Edinburgh, and naturally, with his experience and convictions, he at once joined the Reformers. His long foreign residence of twenty-four years unfitted him at first for preaching in his native tongue; and he preached "now and then to the

¹ *Book of the Universal Kirk*, pp. Knox, *Hist.* ii. 337-345; Calder-8-11; Keith's *Affairs*, iii. 51-59; wood, ii. 183-194.

learneder sort in Latin, in the Magdalene's Chapel at Edinburgh."¹

The adherents of the Roman Church were still numerous in Scotland, and in many places the old services were stealthily continued. Several of the nobles remained firm in their first faith, which had now become as much a political as a religious badge. The prelates of the Church did little to sustain the credit or confirm the faith of their communion. Many of them, as has been seen, were deplorably ignorant and unequal to religious controversy. Quintin Kennedy, abbot of Crossraguel, stood for a time almost alone as the champion of Rome, but never did he stand up for the Scottish prelates or priests.

Kennedy was now joined by a colleague equally zealous and better equipped,—Ninian Winzet, the learned priest and master of the grammar school in Linlithgow. It was one of the many schools of that class, founded by the Church in the old burgh towns of Scotland. Winzet was settled there in 1551, and for nine years continued his scholastic work until expelled by Spottiswoode, the superintendent of the Lothians, from what he calls "the kindly town," because of his refusal to sign the Confession of Faith. After this, he threw himself vigorously into the controversies of the time, disputing with Protestants, and publishing in Edinburgh his tracts, which he scattered broadcast over the land. He was as outspoken as Kennedy in denouncing the profligacy of priest and prelate, which had, as he tells them, brought all this ruin and shame on the Church. Nothing could be more trenchant than the language he addressed to the Roman clergy, men of his own creed, but not of his own good life. He also attacked the nobles for their share in the

¹ Spottiswoode, *Hist.* iii. 91-94.

corruption of church patronage, which had been visited with punishment, he said, in the ruin of many noble families; and he satirised the rapacity of such of their order as had urged a reformation from idolatry, but did not reform themselves from the idolatry of avarice.¹

Winzet wrote a treatise containing eighty-three questions on doctrine and church polity, and sent it to Knox for answer. Knox evaded the challenge, and Winzet plied him with letter after letter. Still receiving no answer, he published his final brochure entitled "The last Blast of the Trumpet of God's word against the usurped authority of John Knox and his Calvinian brethren." Knox answered this by instigating the magistrates of Edinburgh to apprehend Winzet, and burn his tractates. The tractarian managed to escape, but the printer was seized and imprisoned, and all copies of the works were destroyed. Winzet went abroad, and in Antwerp continued his writings, until, in 1576, through the influence of John Leslie, then bishop of Ross by favour of the queen, he was appointed abbot of the Scots Benedictine monastery at Ratisbon, where he died in 1592, at the age of seventy-four. While at Ratisbon, he published his *Flagellum Sectariorum* or Scourge of the Sectaries, and appended to it an answer to George Buchanan's work, *De Jure Regni apud Scotos*.²

Abbot Kennedy continued to defend his religion by pen and speech, and to retaliate upon his opponents. In the autumn of 1562 Knox visited the west country to

¹ Keith's *Affairs*, iii. 416 *seq.*

² For authorities on Winzet's life and writings see Grub, ii. 115-122; Bellesheim, iii. 35-53; *Church of Scot.* ed. Story, ii. 410-414; Spottis-

woode's *Hist.* ii. 15; Keith's *Affairs*, iii. 33, and Appendix, pp. 412-507; Burton, *Hist.* iii. 401.

pledge the protestant nobles and gentry by a bond to maintain their religion and its ministers against all persons and powers opposed to the same.¹ Kennedy was then preaching in the church of Kirk Oswald, in which parish his abbey of Crossraguel was situated, on the subjects in dispute between him and the Protestants. Knox heard of it and challenged the abbot to a public discussion, which took place in the house of the provost of the collegiate church at Maybole. The discussion lasted three days,² and the principal questions debated were the authority of the Church and the doctrine of the mass. The abbot pleaded the universality of the Church's testimony, its catholicity and its infallibility. The Reformer answered the plea by his usual appeal to Scripture, and quoted copiously from the Old Testament, with which he was thoroughly conversant, to show that the prophets were often in antagonism to the Church and priests of their day, who were always ready with the cry, "The temple of the Lord are we." On the subject of the mass, Kennedy minimised the teaching of his Church as to its propitiatory virtue. He admitted that the sacrifice of the cross was the only propitiatory sacrifice, and that the mass was the commemoration of the same,—which was Catholic doctrine, but not as Rome had for centuries been teaching it. Upon this admission Knox observed, "So far as I can conceive of my lord's answer, he maketh no sacrifice propitiatory in the mass which is the chief end I intended to impugn. For, as for the commemoration of Christ's death and passion, that I grant and publicly do confess to be celebrated in the right use of the Lord's Supper, which I deny the mass to be." The dis-

¹ Knox, *Hist.* book iv., gives list of nearly eighty subscribers to the bond, beginning with the provost of Ayr, and including lord Glencairn.

² It might have lasted longer, but the retainers of Knox and the abbot exhausted the supplies of Maybole.

cussion was marked by unusual courtesy and moderation on both sides.¹

Ninian Winzet and Quintin Kennedy were not the only, though they were the chief, defenders of the Roman Church, while its faith was being attacked by a hundred tongues and pens. It is evidence of the low estate of clerical learning among seculars and regulars of the old hierarchy that so few were found competent to enter the lists in defence of what ought to have been dearer to them than life. Some of their ablest men had, no doubt, joined the Reformers, but of the residue it may be said without breach of charity that the salt had lost its savour, and its treatment corresponded to the adage.²

¹ Quintin Kennedy was nephew of the earl of Cassillis, and, under his protection, he lived and died abbot of Crossraguel, his death occurring in August 1564. A copy of Kennedy's Oration, and the Reasoning between him and John Knox is given in M'Gavin's edition of Knox's *History*, pp. 529-572. M'Crie's *Life of Knox*, ii. 66-72.

² Bellesheim, the Roman historian, admits as much when he says that "most of the bishops, unhappily, were lacking in the qualities necessary to make a good defence against the enemy, while the Catholic preachers had neither the courage to provoke discussion nor the ability to conduct it."—*Hist. Cath. Ch. in Scot.* iii. 64.

CHAPTER III

REIGN OF QUEEN MARY, 1562-1565

Pope Pius IV. solicits Mary to send prelates to Council of Trent—Her answer—Visit of Goudanus, papal nuncio—His interview with queen and Roman prelates—His report of religious parties in Scotland—His severe criticism on Scottish Roman prelates and priests—Rebellion of earl of Huntly—Second interview between queen and Knox—Protestant feeling against Romanists—Roman prelates and priests imprisoned for saying mass—Queen opens her first Parliament—Knox's violent language against the queen and papists generally—Third interview between Mary and Knox—Meeting of Assembly at Perth—Knox tried for illegal assembling of queen's subjects—Persecution of Romanists—Assembly presents to queen six articles praying reformation—Knox's second marriage—Queen engaged to Darnley—Their marriage.

ALTHOUGH the Roman Church was disestablished by the Parliament of 1560, the queen still kept in touch with the papal see by secret envoys. It was not easily done from the number of protestant lords about her Court, and their jealousy of Roman emissaries. Pius IV. had already rewarded Mary's fidelity to the faith by the gift of the Golden Rose. Shortly afterwards he begged her to send some of the Scottish prelates and an ambassador to the closing sessions of the Council of Trent. The queen wrote from St. Andrews (18th March 1563) stating her inability to send either prelate or envoy from Scotland, but promising to enforce among her subjects as far as she could, the decrees of the Council. The letter gave much satisfaction at Trent, and the cardinal

of Lorraine, Mary's uncle, spoke for her in the Council, and expressed the hope that some of the Scottish bishops then in France would yet attend.¹ None of them appeared, not even archbishop Beaton of Glasgow, who had been in France for three years. The decrees of the Council of Trent were, therefore, without the assent of any prelate from Scotland.²

On the 19th June 1562 a papal nuncio, a Jesuit known as Goudanus,³ landed at Leith, and, a month after his arrival, an interview was arranged with the queen at Holyrood, while the Protestant lords of her Court were at church. But in spite of every precaution to ensure secrecy, the "strange visage" of the envoy was seen, and many rumours were circulated as to his visit. Mary stated to him the difficulties of her position, and declared with regard to herself that "she would sooner die than abandon the faith." The envoy found equal difficulty in getting access to the bishops. They were so afraid, from the suspicion in which they were held, of being compromised by his visit, that one after another declined it. Bishop Sinclair of Ross, president of the Court of Session, assured the envoy that were he to receive him, "his house would without doubt be destroyed within four-and-twenty hours." Bishop Chisholm, refused to see Goudanus, even in secluded Dunblane, although he had gone thither in the disguise of a servant. The bishop of Dunkeld, "who," says the Jesuit, "resides on an island somewhere, with no other human habitation near," alone ventured to entertain him ; but the conditions were that he should appear as a banker's clerk, and that their conversation during dinner should turn on nothing but money.

¹ Robertson, *Statuta*, pp. 249, 250.

² *Ibid.* p. 287.

³ His real name was Nicholas Floris of Gouda, in Holland.—Bellesheim, iii. 58.

The nuncio kept his eyes and ears open, and as he saw something of the country, his information is not without value. "I will add," he writes, "a few words on the bishops' position at present, and that of the kingdom in general, especially as regards religion. The aspect of things is miserable enough. The monasteries are nearly all in ruins, some completely destroyed; churches, altars, sanctuaries, are overthrown and profaned. The images of Christ and of the saints broken, and lying in the dust. No religious rite is celebrated in any part of the kingdom; no mass ever said in public, except in the queen's chapel; and none of the sacraments are publicly administered with Catholic ceremonial. Children can be baptized only after the heretical form, and that on Sundays only,¹ so that many infants die unbaptized. The ministers, as they call them, are either apostate monks or laymen of low rank, and are quite unlearned, being cobblers, shoemakers, tanners, or the like, while their ministrations consist merely of declamation against the Supreme Pontiff and the holy sacrifice of the altar, the idolatry of the mass, worship of images, and invocation of saints. These and other impieties they are constantly shouting into the ears of the credulous multitude who know no better. They are so insane as not only to have destroyed the images of the saints, but also burnt the writings of the holy fathers of the Church, thus repudiating the authority of general councils and apostolic tradition. They reverence nothing but Holy Scripture, and this they interpret in a sense as opposite as possible to the doctrines of the Church. They have superintendents who diligently visit the churches, drive out by force the legitimate pastors wherever they find any, and not only confirm the wretched people in their

¹ The Jesuit's accuracy in this particular, as to which he is confirmed by the Book of Discipline, adds somewhat to the credibility of his narrative.

errors, but draw away Catholics, and sometimes even priests, from the true religion. One day, close to the place where I lodged, three priests publicly abjured the Catholic faith ; and another time, while I was there, one of the principal superintendents, a doctor of theology and a monk, then about seventy years of age, was openly married. This was done to enforce practically, as he had often done verbally, their doctrine of the unlawfulness of the vow of chastity which they are perpetually proclaiming from the pulpit. They use every possible device to lead the wretched people astray. Whenever any one comes into a court of law, the magistrates always inquire first if they are ' Papists,' or belong to their Congregation. Should they be Papists they can get very little, if any, attention paid to their cause. The men in power acknowledge the queen's title, but prevent her exercising any of the rights of sovereignty. Whenever her opinion does not agree with theirs, they oppose her at once. Not only so, but they deceive her as well, and frighten her with threats of an English invasion, especially when she is meditating any steps in support of her faith, reminding her that the English did really invade Scotland three years ago, at the time when her mother, of pious memory, endeavoured to shake off her heretical tyrants with the aid of the French. What can this good young princess effect, brought up amid the splendour and luxury of the French Court, scarcely twenty years old, and destitute of all human support and counsel ? Her very confessor abandoned her just before I came away, and returned to France with some of her Catholic attendants, leaving her alone among heretics, whom, notwithstanding, she continues to resist and counteract to the best of her power. There is no mistaking the imminent peril of her situation."

What Goudanus further reports about the Roman Catholic preachers and bishops in Scotland has been often repeated in substance since his day. From him it has all the freshness of a report at first hand, besides the value of a witness against his own side, which may warrant further quotations. "There are some Catholic preachers of note, but they are few in number, and seldom venture to attack controversial points, being indeed unequal to the task of handling them with effect. Only a few Religious (Monastics) are left, and most of them have no fixed residence, but go about from place to place, or wear the secular habit, and live among their friends. The priests, of whom but few remain, are not distinguishable from laymen in dress or appearance. The nobles and wealthy Catholics hear mass occasionally with the greatest secrecy, and in their own houses. Indeed, any public profession of the orthodox religion would expose them and their whole families to immediate danger." He next states the causes to which "the best and most sensible Catholics" attribute all their misfortunes. "They consider them," he says, "as owing to the suspension of the ordinary mode of election to abbacies and other high dignities. These preferments are conferred upon children, or other incapable persons, without any care for God's honour and the service of the Church, and very often one such person holds several offices in the same church. For instance, a son of one of the bishops has been appointed to the archdeaconry and two canonries in his father's cathedral. Besides which, the lives of priests and clerics are not unfrequently such as to cause grave scandal, an evil increased by the supine indifference and negligence of the bishops themselves. . . . I will not describe the way in which their prelates live, the example they set, or the sort of men they nominate as their successors ; only it is hardly surprising if God's flock

is eaten up by wolves, while such shepherds as these have charge of it.”¹

In the year 1562, Mary was engaged in crushing the incipient rebellion of the earl of Huntly, who exercised a feudal sovereignty over the north country, as extensive as Argyll's in the west, and was familiarly known as “Cock of the North.” Aberdeen, then no mean city, with its cathedral and university, was virtually his capital. He had saved its cathedral from the spoilers, and even now his castle of Strathbogie was the receptacle of its holy vessels, vestments, and other treasures, until the hoped-for restitution should come.² The earl was a travelled and accomplished man, the mainstay of Romanism in the north, and boasted that he could set up the old religion in three counties. His position as chancellor had given him an additional influence in the crooked politics of the time ; but his dealings with the late queen-regent, though he was a professed Catholic, had been vacillating and inconsistent. Mary mistrusted him, and on a visit which she made by way of Aberdeen to Inverness, she declined his overtures for reconciliation. The result was Huntly's revolt and the battle of Corrichie, sixteen miles from Aberdeen, in which the earl was defeated. He surrendered with two of his sons, and immediately afterwards died of apoplexy.³ His son, Sir John Gordon, was beheaded at Aberdeen ; and the heir of Huntly and eleven barons of the house of Gordon, including the earl of Sutherland, were attainted. The punishment may have been merited,

¹ Extracts are from the translation of Goudanus by Father Forbes Leith, in his *Narratives of the Scottish Catholics*, pp. 72-76. The letter was written by Goudanus to the general of the Jesuits, and dated Mayence, 30th September 1562. See also Robertson's *Statuta*, p. clxv. ; Belles-

heim, iii. 58-65.

² Some of this ecclesiastical spoil was used to fit up the lodgings for Darnley in the Kirk-of-Field where he was murdered.

³ See the Marquis of Huntly's *Records of Aboyne*, New Spalding Club, pp. 466, 467.

but it was not politic ; for if every lord guilty of treason in those times had been attainted, the queen would have found difficulty in forming a Privy Council.

The fall of Huntly did not appease the Protestants or make them more reasonable in their demands. The preachers attacked the queen, not only directly in their sermons, but obliquely in their prayers. "They pray," said Randolph, the English ambassador, who was an abettor of their general policy, in his letter to Cecil, "that God will keep us from the bondage of strangers ; and for herself (the queen), as much in effect as that God will either turn her heart or send her short life. Of what charity or spirit this proceedeth, I leave to be discussed by the great divines."¹ Mary's forbearance with Knox did not moderate his invectives, which were often so coarse as to excite either ridicule or indignation. Maitland, as his manner was, answered them with a scoff, Morton bade Knox hold his peace, and Randolph lamented that he had more zeal than charity.²

The queen's dancing gave special offence to Knox, and on a second visit to Holyrood, he told her that she and her Court were "more exercised in fiddling and flinging than in reading or hearing God's word." The queen remarked, "Your words are sharp enough as you have spoken them, but yet they were told me in another manner. If ye hear anything of me," she added, "that mislikes you, come to myself and tell me, and I shall hear you." This was no doubt honestly meant ; but Knox answered that while he was "appointed by God to rebuke the vices of all, he could not go to every man in particular and show him his offence ; nor could he wait her

¹ MS. letter, Randolph to Cecil, State-paper Office, 28th Feb. 1562-63, cited by Tytler, *Hist.* v. 228.

See also Knox, *Hist. Ref.* M'Gavin's ed. p. 306.

² Tytler, v. 228.

grace's pleasure at her chamber door." Knox thereupon departed "with a reasonable merry countenance," and to the remark of a courtier that he was not afraid to speak, he made the ready reply, "Why should the pleasing face of a gentlewoman affray me? I have looked in the face of many angry men, and yet have not been affrayed above measure."¹

Severe penalties had been decreed against the Romanists; but, under the protection of friendly barons, they continued their meetings and celebrations. At the Easter of 1563 several of the Roman ecclesiastics in the west openly celebrated mass, which gave such offence to the Protestants that they seized some of the priests, and avowed their intention no longer to complain to queen or Council, but to take the law into their own hands and execute punishment upon "the papish idolaters." The queen, who was then at Lochleven, became alarmed for the safety of her co-religionists, and sent for Knox. She remonstrated against the threatened illegal violence, and pleaded with him for toleration. He reminded her of the laws enacted against popery, and of her duty and that of the magistrates to punish the infraction of these laws; and, failing this, he said, subjects were justified in taking the law into their own hands.²

Ruffled as Mary was by Knox's language she met him again next morning while pursuing her favourite pastime of hawking, and talked confidentially with him upon different subjects. She warned him against Gordon, the bishop of Galloway, the pope's titular archbishop of Athens, who was now seeking election as superintendent of Galloway, and Knox admits that the queen was not deceived in her estimate of the bishop.³ She spoke of

¹ Knox, *Hist.* pp. 269-271.

² Tytler, v. 237.

³ Knox, *Hist.* M'Gavin's ed. p. 285.

the unfriendly terms on which the earl and countess of Argyll were living, and advised Knox to write to the earl, a commission which he executed in a characteristic letter to his lordship.¹ Before parting with Knox the queen promised to enforce the penal laws against the Romanists, a promise which she duly kept, inconsistent as her conduct was in punishing her subjects for adherence to a religion which she had declared to be dearer to herself than life. The archbishop of St. Andrews, Fleming, prior of Whithorn, and forty-six others, were tried in Edinburgh for celebrating or assisting at mass, and sentenced to various terms of imprisonment.² Other priests fled for safety to England.

The trial of the Romanists took place on the 19th May (1563); and two days after, Mary, accompanied by a brilliant retinue of lords and ladies, opened her first Parliament in the Tolbooth. The beauty of the queen, and the grace with which she delivered the royal speech, captivated the people. "God save that sweet face," they exclaimed; "was there ever orator spake so properly and so sweetly?" Her popularity on this occasion was deeply galling to Knox. "Such stinking pride of women," he says, "as was seen at that Parliament, was never seen before in Scotland."³ The preachers railed in their sermons at the dresses of the Court ladies, "the targeting of their tails"⁴ and the rest of their vanity"; and Knox inveighed against the queen's proposed marriage with "an infidel," the king of Spain; "for all papists," said he, "are infidels." The Reformer admits that his language "was judged intolerable — that papists and

¹ The letter is given by Knox, *Hist.* pp. 286, 287; see also Keith's *Affairs*, ii. 198.

² Tytler, *Hist.* v. 238.

³ Knox, *Hist.* p. 288.

⁴ That is, hoop petticoats. See Sharpe's Biographical Notice, prefixed to Kirkton's *History*, p. xix.

protestants were both offended ; yea, his most familiars," he says, "disdained him for that speaking."¹

Mary sent for Knox to Holyrood, and Erskine of Dun accompanied him to the palace. She reminded the preacher how she had borne with his hard speeches, sought his favour by all possible means, and offered him audience whensoever it pleased him to admonish her,—but still he railed at her. Knox says she was in "a vehement fume," and wept copiously all the time, the serving boy not being able to supply her with napkins enough to dry her eyes. To her remonstrance he answered, "Madam, in preaching I am not master of myself, but must obey Him who commands me to speak plain, and to flatter no flesh upon the face of the earth." "But what have you to do," said she passionately, "with my marriage? or what are you in this commonwealth?" "A subject born within the same," said Knox proudly ; "and albeit I am neither earl, lord, nor baron within it, yet has God made me—how abject that ever I am in your eyes—a profitable member within the same." He told Mary that far from delighting in the weeping of any of God's creatures he could scarcely abide the tears of his own boys when he whipped them. Knox withdrew, and while waiting for Erskine he occupied his time in moralising to the "fair ladies" in waiting on their pomps and vanities and "gay gear."

The Assembly met at Perth on the 25th June 1563, and issued commissions, which were to last for a year, to the bishops of Galloway, Orkney, and Caithness to plant new churches in their dioceses. Similar commissions were granted to a number of ministers in other districts. A more singular order was given by the Assembly to the superintendents to examine all books and manuscripts

¹ Knox, p. 290.

on religious subjects, and to permit nothing to be circulated but what had met with their approval. Liberty of the press was as foreign to the mind of the Protestants as it had been to the mind of the Roman hierarchy.¹

In the autumn of the year the queen made a progress to the western counties ; and while she was at Stirling her private chapel in Holyrood was invaded by Protestants on a Sunday when the worshippers, who included others besides the queen's servants, were assembled for mass. The result was a riot which had to be quelled by the magistrates. Two of the rioters were identified and summoned to underlie the law ; whereupon Knox issued a fiery manifesto, in the form of a circular letter, calling upon the leading men of the Congregation to convene in Edinburgh on the day of the trial, " for the advancement of God's glory, the safety of your brethren, and your own assurance." Knox's device had been long familiar to the Scots. Feudal barons used to muster their armed retainers in court to overawe the magistrates, and the Protestants more than once during the Reformation struggle had recourse to the same strategy. Unfortunately for Knox, a copy of his circular fell into the hands of bishop Sinclair, president of the Court of Session, who showed it to the queen. Knox was thereupon cited before the Council to answer for illegally convening the queen's lieges for treasonable objects. Mary thought she had now caught Knox in his own toils, and when she saw him at the farther end of the table she remarked to Maitland, " Yon man made me greet, and grat never a tear himself : I will see if I can cause him greet." The Council was composed largely of members of the Congregation, who took a favourable view of Knox's defence " that he made convo-

¹ *Book of the Universal Kirk*, pp. 14-16 ; Calderwood, ii. 223-229 ; Keith's *Affairs*, iii. 71-77.

cation of the people to hear prayers and sermon almost daily." Mary retorted smartly, "I say nothing against your religion or against your convening to your sermons. But what authority have you to convocate my subjects when ye will, without my commandment?" Knox pleaded that he had acted at the command of the Kirk, and ended by an attack upon "the pestilent papists who are sons of the devil, and must therefore obey the desires of their father, who has been a liar and a manslayer from the beginning." He was interrupted by the remark, which had a touch of humour in it, that he was not now in his pulpit. Knox was acquitted, and on leaving the Council he addressed the queen, "I pray God to purge your heart from papistry, and to preserve you from the counsel of flatterers." The like language addressed to queen Elizabeth would have sent him to the Tower. "That night," he adds with evident glee, "were neither dancing nor fiddling in her court, for madam was disappointed of her purpose."¹

An incident which happened in the spring of 1565 shows the bitterness of partisan feeling between Protestant and Papist. Knox, who gives the story in full,² writes that the protestant communion was administered in Edinburgh on the 1st April, and that when some Romanists celebrated their Easter communion, the priest, named Tarbet, was seized, along with the master of the house and one or two more of his assistants, and taken to the Tolbooth, where the priest was rehabilitated in his vestments, carried to the market cross, and bound to it for an hour, chalice in hand, while the women and children pelted him with Easter eggs.³ Next day Tarbet was convicted

¹ Knox, *Hist.* pp. 296-299. Skelton, *Maitland of Lethington*, ii. 54-57.

² *Hist.* pp. 323, 324.

³ Teulet, *Relations Politiques*, ii. 197.

at an assize (the first day's proceedings had not even the colour of law); "and albeit," writes Knox, "for the same offence he deserved death, yet for all punishment he was set upon the market cross for the space of three or four hours, the hangman standing by and keeping him while the boys and others were busy with eggs casting." The papists interposed, there was a riot, and presently the provost and the town's halberdiers carried the priest back to the Tolbooth. Such was the price paid for an Easter communion at Edinburgh in 1565. Knox has not a word of censure for the disgraceful treatment of a man who was no doubt as sincere in his religious convictions as himself. Probably he thought that the priest escaped cheaply for an act which by the protestant laws deserved death.

Offence had been taken by the lord James, now earl of Moray, at Knox's intemperate language, and for eighteen months they were estranged from each other. On the eve of the queen's marriage they were reconciled; and from that date there was a change in Moray's attitude as to the queen's free exercise of her religion, for which he had hitherto claimed tolerance. The Assembly of June 1565 appointed a commission of "the church national" to present six articles to the queen, desiring her to ratify the same in Parliament. The first article subjected the queen to the same penalties as her subjects for "the papistical and blasphemous mass"; the second aimed at better provision for the ministers, and for "their trial and admission by the superintendents and overseers"; the third required "that none be permitted to have charge of souls, colleges, or universities, but such as were tried by the superintendents and found sound in doctrine"; the fourth recommended the recovery of portions of the Church lands and rents for the sustenta-

tion of the poor and of town schools ; the fifth craved that various "horrible crimes," including witchcraft, sorcery, enchantment, should be suppressed ; and the sixth was framed "to ease the poor labourers of the ground," who were oppressed by the tithe leasers set over their heads.¹

With some exceptions, which will be obvious to the reader, the legislation desired by the Assembly was highly commendable. The articles were submitted to the queen's Council, and answers made that her Majesty could not forsake the religion in which she had been nourished ; and that while liberty of conscience was given to her subjects, they should not press her conscience. With some qualifications the second article was granted, and the others were to be submitted to Parliament.

The queen was in Dunkeld when the five commissioners presented the above articles to her. On her return to Edinburgh by St. Johnstone (Perth) it was rumoured that the protestant lords, Moray, Argyll, and others, meant to intercept and capture her and Darnley at the pass of Drone by the Ochils ; but Mary was early in the saddle and outstripped them by a couple of hours, never slackening rein until she reached Queensferry. She proceeded the same night to Callendar, near Falkirk, where she was present at the baptism of lord Livingstone's child, and heard, for the first time, a protestant sermon, "which," adds Knox, "was reckoned a great matter."

Knox, who lectured the ladies of the Court on their vanities, gave proof that with all his sternness he was not insensible to the charms of the fair sex. In the third year of his widowhood, at the mature age of sixty, he took for his second wife a daughter of lord Ochiltree who

¹ Knox's *Works*, Laing's ed. ii. 484-490.

was then in her seventeenth year.¹ The marriage took place on Palm Sunday, and was the subject of gossip for some time both in court circles and in cottage homes, but the Ochiltree family were said to have been pleased with the match. Knox is described at this period as a clerical dandy, and some of his critics also refer to his Anglicised speech due to his long residence in England and among English people abroad. These are both characteristics, "Anglified and dandified," which are not commonly associated with the name of John Knox.²

The public talk about Knox and his wedding gave place to comment on a marriage of more moment to the nation. Mary also had spent a widowhood of three years, and had been wooed by kings and princes near and far. Queen Elizabeth in her diplomacy, which was a web of duplicity all through, opposed each suitor in turn. She professed to encourage her own favourite Dudley, whom she had recently made earl of Leicester, but nothing was farther from her wishes. In her heart she had no desire that the queen of the Scots should marry at all, because she could not brook the idea of any child of Mary succeeding her on the English throne. Mary ended the diplomatic duplicity by accepting the hand of her cousin, Henry Stuart, lord Darnley, son of the earl of Lennox, and after herself the nearest heir to the *English* throne.

¹ It was currently reported at the time that Knox had proposed to a daughter of the duke of Chatelherault and had been refused. His first wife was a Miss Marjory Bowes, whom he met at Berwick, daughter of Sir Robert Bowes, a courtier under Henry VIII. and his son Edward VI. Of this marriage Knox had two sons, Nathaniel and Eleazer, both educated at St. John's college, Cambridge. The elder became a Fellow of his

college, and was therefore an ordained priest of the Church of England, and died in 1580. The younger became vicar of Clacton-Magna in Essex, and died there in 1591. The gravestone bears the inscription: "The Rev. Eleazer Knox, son of the Scots Reformer, and vicar of the parish." Neither son left issue.—M'Crie's *Life*, ii. 268.

² Laing's edition of Knox's *Works*, vi. 532, 533.

The queen was then in her twenty-second year and Darnley in his nineteenth. Sir James Melvil, envoy from Scotland to Elizabeth, who knew Darnley well at the English Court, describes him at this time as "a lusty young prince, handsome, beardless, and lady-faced."¹ His worst features were not in his face. He was a vain conceited youth, hot and unbridled in temper, and addicted to vices, of all which the queen was unhappily ignorant.² He was in no way worthy of Mary, nor of the honour which her choice had conferred upon him, and his elevation ripened his worst qualities. This ill-starred alliance was Mary's first fatal mistake. The marriage was performed according to the Roman ritual in the private chapel at Holyrood, by John Sinclair, dean of Restalrig, at the early hour of six in the morning, on Sunday 29th July 1565. Mary attended mass after the marriage, but Darnley withdrew in the company of some protestant lords. Next day he was proclaimed king of the Scots at the market cross of Edinburgh.³

A dispensation had been procured for the marriage from the pope, Mary and Darnley being in relationship within the degrees forbidden by canon law. Pius IV. had not abandoned the hope of reclaiming Scotland to the Roman faith through the agency of the queen. In the previous year, June 1564, he had sent her the Acts of the Council of Trent with a letter in which he asks her to dismiss all heretics from her council, and to urge the two metropolitans

¹ *Memoirs*, pp. 83, 94.

² Cardinal de Lorraine called him "un gentil hutaudeau." — Teulet, *R. P.* ii. 199.

³ "From a contemporary Italian document, addressed to Cosmo de Medici, and published by Labanoff (*Recueil de Lettres*, tom. vii. p. 60), it appears that Mary had been secretly

married to Darnley at Stirling, early in April. This is confirmed by the letters of Paul de Foix, the French ambassador, to Catherine de Medici, quoted by Teulet." (Bellesheim, iii. 81, translator's note.) See Teulet's *Relations Politiques avec l'Ecosse*, ii. 193, for de Foix's letter, dated 26th April.

to enforce the decrees of Trent. Neither of them was in a position at the time to enforce anything, for Hamilton was in prison and Beaton in exile. Mary answered the pope that she would do her utmost to enforce the decrees of Trent—a vain promise; and to recover to the faith those that had fallen from it, which was an equally vain hope.¹

A few weeks before her marriage Mary issued a proclamation “certifying and assuring all her good subjects, that, as they had not hitherto been molested in the quiet using of their religion and conscience, so should they not be disquieted in that behalf in any time to come.”² In ordinary circumstances the religious toleration proclaimed by the sovereign would have been gladly accepted by subjects. It is all that is contended for in the present age when civil and religious liberty has become a constitutional watchword. But it was not the liberty desiderated then by the dominant faction. Liberty with them meant tyranny over others, the power to crush and exterminate the professors of every religion but their own. The queen was, so far, both fair and consistent; and in a letter to the Assembly she demanded the same freedom of conscience for herself in matters of religion that she freely accorded her subjects. Mary’s adherence to her inherited faith through good and evil fortune, and in spite of many temptations to be false to it, is the chief redeeming feature in her tragic history.

¹ Bellesheim, iii. 79.

² Robertson *Statuta*, p. clxix.

CHAPTER IV

REIGN OF QUEEN MARY, 1565-1567

Rebellion of nobles—Knox abets the rebels and is summoned before the Council—Filling of vacant sees—Queen's alleged connection with a foreign League to oppress Protestants—Murder of Rizzio—Darnley's complicity—Knox leaves Edinburgh—Birth of prince James—His baptism by archbishop Hamilton—Confession of Faith by Swiss Reformers sent to Scotland—Contrast with Scottish Confession—Ecclesiastical polity of the time—Revival of the primate's consistorial jurisdiction—Divorce of Bothwell—Darnley's murder—Queen's capture by Bothwell—Their marriage—Queen's imprisonment in Lochleven—George Buchanan moderator of Assembly, 1567—Its Resolutions—Deposition of the queen—Moray made Regent.

THE marriage of the queen was the signal for rebellion by a section of the nobles. The duke of Chatelherault (Hamilton) opposed the marriage, partly out of dislike to the Lennox family, but chiefly because it diminished the chances of his own family's succession to the throne. The earls of Argyll, Glencairn, and some others, raised the cry of the Protestant Church in danger, and the earl of Moray, the leader of the disaffected, harped on the same string in a letter to Elizabeth. She, with her usual duplicity, stirred up the troubles from jealousy of queen Mary and disappointment at the union of the two nearest heirs to the English Crown, whom she would probably have played off against each other, had their interests remained separate. The revolt of the nobles was speedily crushed by the energy

of Mary, and the rebel lords were condemned in Parliament and attainted.¹

Knox abetted the rebels, and preached in St. Giles' against "the regimen of godless princes" and "that harlot Jezebel," and how "the people were punished for not taking order against them by having boys and women set over them." Darnley, who was present—he now vacillated between sermons in St. Giles' and an occasional mass in Holyrood²—took deep offence at the abusive language. Knox honestly admits that he "had tarried an hour or more longer in preaching than the time appointed; and that the king, sitting in a throne made for that purpose, was so moved at this sermon that he would not dine; and being troubled, with great fury he passed in the afternoon to the hawking."³ The preacher was summoned before the Council, but they were as little successful in reasoning with him as the queen had been. The Council ordered him to abstain from preaching for fifteen or twenty days, and Craig, his colleague, to take his place. Enforced silence was perhaps the sorest penalty they could have inflicted upon Knox.

The cause of the Congregation was seriously weakened by the banishment of the rebel lords, and Mary took advantage of their absence to extend favours to her Roman Catholic subjects. Several of the nobles now went to mass in her chapel, as did also the king, and friars were once more permitted to preach. Two episcopal sees were vacant, and the time was deemed opportune for filling them. Donald Campbell, who had been bishop-elect of Brechin, but never consecrated, died in 1562; and Henry Sinclair, bishop of Ross and president of the Court of Session, died in Paris early in 1565. John

¹ Skelton's *Mary Stuart*, pp. 70, 71.

² Teulet, *R. P.* ii. 259.

³ *Hist. Ref.* p. 332.

Sinclair, who had celebrated the queen's marriage, became bishop of Brechin, and also president of the Court of Session in succession to his brother. The new president was an eminent jurist, and one of the few moderate churchmen who advocated such a reformation of ecclesiastical abuses as would have preserved the integrity and continuity of the Church. Unfortunately he died in the first year of his episcopate, and his successor in Brechin was Alexander Campbell, a second cadet and nominee of the house of Argyll, who was never consecrated, but did what was no doubt expected of him,—he alienated the properties of the see to his noble patron, who was already laden with the spoils of western bishoprics and monasteries, and who carefully concealed the titles of the same when called to make count and reckoning. Bishop Henry Sinclair was succeeded in the see of Ross by John Leslie, Official of Aberdeen. He became the zealous advocate of the unfortunate queen, whom he loyally served in perils and in prisons, and the historian of the tragic scenes in which he played an honourable part.¹

Knox had probably good grounds for suspecting that the queen was aiming by this policy at a relaxation of the laws which pressed upon her Catholic subjects. The history of the period implicates Mary in a political intrigue of a more questionable character. Catherine de Medici, the queen-dowager of France, and the duke of Alva, representing the interests of Spain, had met in the summer of 1565 at Bayonne, and concocted a League which was to unite the Roman Catholic sovereigns on the Continent in a common crusade against Protestantism. Two envoys came from France to Scotland, the one from

¹ Keith's *Catalogue*, pp. 165, 194, 198-200; *Diurnal of Occurrents*, p. 79; Irving's *Scottish Writers*, i. 122-127. See as to Leslie's consecration at Rome, Innes's *Critical Essay*, i. 290, 291.

cardinal Lorraine, and the other from archbishop Beaton, who acted as Mary's ambassador, to obtain the queen's adherence to the League. Tytler states without any reserve that in an evil hour Mary joined it. Burton quotes Tytler, and seems to agree with him, adding that, "whether in the form of a bond or not, beyond doubt Mary was the close ally of the king of Spain in all his formidable views and projects for crushing the new religion." Randolph, the English envoy in Scotland, wrote to Cecil on the 7th February 1566 that "there was a band lately devised in which the late pope (Pius IV.), the emperor, the king of Spain, the duke of Savoy, with other princes of Italy and the queen-mother, were suspected to be of the same confederacy to maintain papistry throughout Christendom. This band was sent out of France by Thornton, and is subscribed by this queen." Dr. Grub challenges the evidence on which queen Mary has been accused of joining the League. The evidence points to a strong suspicion against Mary, but it seems hardly sufficient to convict her of putting her hand to the bond.¹

Mary was soon after embroiled in domestic troubles which diverted her attention from foreign politics. A Piedmontese of humble origin, named David Rizzio, who had been in her service at the French Court, became, from his musical gifts, a singer in her private chapel. His knowledge of languages commended him for the office of private secretary, although Sir James Melvil says that he wrote French so badly that Mary had often to rewrite his letters. A temporary estrangement between the queen and Maitland, secretary of State, threw additional duties

¹ See Tytler, v. 331; Burton, iv. 135, 136; Thomas Wright's *Queen Elizabeth, and her Times*, i. 219, 220; Grub, ii. 147, and references.

Wright says in a note that "there seems to be no doubt that Mary had secretly joined the confederacy."

upon Rizzio, and he became inordinately vain and conceited. The nobles were jealous of him, and indignant that a foreigner in birth and an alien in religion should have so close an intimacy with the queen. Rizzio's dress, manners, and conduct all told against him. Melvil warned him to walk warily in the midst of men who had each a dagger ready for him.¹ Rizzio represented his danger to the queen, but she was a high-spirited woman, and intolerant of dictation in what she considered her own private affairs. "If the sovereign," she said, "finds a man of low estate, poor in means, but generous in mind, faithful in heart, and well adapted to fill an office in his service, will he not dare to intrust him with any authority, because the nobles who already possess power are ever craving for more?"² The doomed secretary gave additional offence to the protestant nobility by advising Mary not to pardon the banished nobles. Darnley was no less hostile to him, believing that his influence withheld the queen from conferring on him "the crown-matrimonial," which would, in case of Mary's death, have passed the crown to her husband and his issue.³

At this critical juncture Parliament was summoned in March 1566. The chief business was to pass a bill of attainder against the earl of Moray and the other rebel lords. But it was easier said than done. Moray was not without friends at Court, and these friends had recourse to the usual Scottish device—a secret bond. Meanwhile the Protestants in Edinburgh had proclaimed a public fast on the Sunday, and sermons were preached on such subjects as the destruction of Oreb and Zeb, the death of Sisera, and the hanging of Haman. On Saturday evening of that week, 9th March 1566, the conspirators in the

¹ Sir James Melvil's *Memoirs*, p. 109.

² Grub, ii. 148.

³ Burton, *Hist.* iv. 138.

bond accomplished their object—the murder of Rizzio. The queen was at supper with the ladies of the Court, Darnley stood by her chair, not ignorant of the plot, when lord Ruthven, who had risen from a sickbed, followed by George Douglas, Darnley's cousin, and others, entered the room. Rizzio was seized while clinging to the dress of the queen for protection, dragged out of the apartment, and slain in an outer chamber, stabbed in fifty places.¹ In the scuffle, Black, a Dominican friar, was also killed.

The conspirators are said to have been ready with proposals to confer the crown matrimonial on Darnley, to compel the queen to confirm the protestant religion, and to ratify the proceedings of the banished lords, under the penalty of her death or perpetual imprisonment.² Mary outmanœuvred them by persuading Darnley to sever himself from his evil associates, and flee with her to Dunbar. There she was joined by archbishop Hamilton, now released from prison, the earl of Huntly, who had been restored to his father's titles, and the earls of Atholl, Bothwell, and others. She was soon at the head of 8000 men; and on her march to Edinburgh the conspirators fled. The queen intimated her success to the bishop of Dunblane, who was then in Rome, and asked him to inform the new pope (Pius V.), and to intreat his aid and sympathy. She had previously requested the same favour, and his Holiness sent the bishop of Mendovi with a hundred thousand crowns, but the envoy never got farther than Paris, and returned to Rome, blaming Mary's indifference for the failure of his mission.³

It is an open question whether Knox was privy to the plot to assassinate Rizzio. Tytler says that he was, and

¹ Teulet, *Relations*, etc. ii. 261; Tytler, v. 345 and note p. 501.

² Tytler, v. 348.

³ See Keith, ii. 600, 601, and Labanoff, i. 370; vii. 107, 108.

gives the evidence at great length. One thing is certain, that he afterwards heartily approved of the murder as a "just act most worthy of all praise." "To let the world understand," he writes, "in plain terms what we mean, that great abuse of this commonwealth, that poltroon and vile knave Davie (Rizzio) was justly punished on the 9th of March."¹ A week after the secretary's murder, on Sunday the 17th March, Knox fled from Edinburgh, which strengthened the suspicions against him, and "buried himself in the friendly recesses of Kyle," while Craig, his colleague, remained in the city. He did not return to Edinburgh until after the queen's imprisonment in Lochleven.

More important to Mary than the disputed guilt of Knox was the question of Darnley's guilt. Upon being accused he denied complicity in the crime, and then basely revealed the names of the conspirators. When the bond was afterwards shown to the queen, bearing her husband's name, it was the deathblow to any lingering affection or respect she may have felt for him.²

Mary gave birth to a son in the castle of Edinburgh, 19th June 1566. There were difficulties in the way of the prince's baptism, but on the 9th October the mother informed the pope that she had obtained the consent of her nobles to have him baptized according to the Roman rite. Two months more elapsed, and on 17th December the child was baptized under the names Charles James, in the chapel royal, Stirling, by the primate Hamilton,³ attended by other bishops, and in presence of the queen

¹ See Tytler, v. note, 498-507; Burton, iv. 150; M'Crie's *Life of Knox*, ii. 145, 146.

² Teulet, *Relations*, etc. ii. 265, 266.

³ The archbishop would have

used the spittle, which is part of the Roman ritual for baptism, but the queen forbade it, with a stinging remark reflecting upon the primate's immoral life. — Robertson, *Statuta*, ii. 309; Keith's *Affairs*, ii. 286.

and distinguished sponsors, by proxy, for queen Elizabeth, the king of France, and the duke of Savoy. Some of the noblemen refused to be present at the service because it was popish, and the countess of Argyll, who was proxy for queen Elizabeth, had to do penance by order of the General Assembly for her presence on the occasion.¹ Darnley absented himself from the baptism, resenting the refusal of Elizabeth's envoys to address him as king. The baptism of the prince was the last public sacramental act of the old Roman hierarchy.

In the month of September the superintendents and ministers had met at St. Andrews to consider a Confession of Faith compiled by the Swiss Reformers. In their answer, addressed to Beza, the Scottish Protestants express entire agreement with the doctrines of their Helvetian brethren except on one point. "This one thing, however," they reply, "we can scarcely refrain from mentioning with regard to what is written in the 24th chapter of the aforesaid Confession, concerning the festivals of our Lord's Nativity, Circumcision, Passion, Resurrection, Ascension, and sending the Holy Ghost upon His disciples, that these festivals at the present time obtain no place among us; for we dare not religiously celebrate any other feast day than what the divine oracles have prescribed. Everything else, as we have said, we teach, approve, and most willingly embrace."² The Scottish Protestants at this time were the only religious community in Christendom that disowned the fasts and festivals of the Christian year.

During the six years that had run since the Reformation of 1560, the Roman Catholic prelates held their seats in Parliament and in Council, as did also the titular protestant bishops recently appointed. It was an

¹ Keith's *Affairs*, ii. 486.

² Knox, *Hist.* p. 348; Grub, ii. 152.

unsatisfactory medley of ecclesiastical polity. Probably Mary and her advisers clung to this vestige of the old establishment in the hope that a day of restitution would come. Some such hope may have prompted her at this time when she re-invested archbishop Hamilton with his former consistorial jurisdiction. It was an ill-advised step—as impolitic as it was illegal. One of the primate's acts in this court was to grant, on the ground of consanguinity, a decree of divorce between Bothwell and lady Jane Gordon, sister of Huntly, to whom he had been married but a few months. Four days before, Bothwell had been divorced in the protestant Commissary Court, Edinburgh, for adultery.¹ This divorce was the first act in a very painful tragedy. The Assembly memorialised the Privy Council against the “usurped authority of the cruel murderer of our dear brethren, most falsely styled archbishop of St. Andrews,”² and Knox inveighed in no measured terms against the primate's exercise of consistorial powers. For a brief hour the archbishop was triumphant. He rode into Edinburgh in January 1567, at the head of a hundred horsemen, his own retainers, with all the prelatic pride and pomp of other days. The capital had been ecclesiastically the second city of his diocese, as St. Andrews was the first, but he was now as unpopular in Edinburgh as on a former occasion he had been in St. Andrews, when Knox first measured his strength against him. Threatened by the populace, the primate withdrew from the capital, and we hear little more of him until we find him made prisoner in Dunbarton castle, and, soon after, the victim of the halter at Stirling.

Immediately after the baptism of his son, Darnley, still sulking, went from Stirling to reside with his father,

¹ Roberston, *Statuta*, p. clxxx.

² Burton, iv. 220.

"Old Lennox," in Glasgow. His life had been daily becoming more dissolute; no one at Court respected him, no one cared for him. As a last resource he allied himself with the extreme section of the Roman Catholics, who were dissatisfied with what they regarded as the temporising policy of queen Mary, and with them he entered on the mad enterprise of establishing the papal religion in both England and Scotland. So much for the wayward youth who, on his wedding day, three years before, would not countenance a celebration of the mass.

At Glasgow, Darnley was seized with small-pox. Knox attributed his sickness to poison. Mary sent her physician, and, at Darnley's request, visited him in person, when a reconciliation was believed to have been effected.¹ It is difficult to sift the truth to the bottom. A woman's heart is a deep well, and the water is not always clear. It is hard to decide whether the queen was a conspirator or a victim. The whole ground quaked with treachery.² Mary suggested her husband's removal to the neighbourhood of Edinburgh. Lennox was suspicious of the proposal, and so was Darnley,—perhaps both uncharitably so far as regarded the queen. Craigmillar castle was first named; and ultimately the house of the provost of the collegiate church of St. Mary-in-the-fields³ was selected for Darnley's convalescent home. Thither he was borne by easy stages, and there Mary visited him, for the last time on Sunday evening, 9th February. Next night the house was blown up with gunpowder, and Darnley's dead body, nearly naked, was found in the

¹ Hossack's *Mary Queen of Scots*, i. 186.

² The most recent attempt to unravel the entanglement and clear the

queen is Dr. Skelton's *Mary Stuart*, pp. 91-101.

³ Where Edinburgh University now stands.

adjoining garden, unscathed by fire, and strangled, as was the general belief.¹

Suspicion of the murder fell upon many, including the queen herself; but if she may charitably be exonerated from so terrible a charge, no extenuation can avail for her subsequent conduct. The prime instigator of the deed was Bothwell, aided by a conspiracy of nobles who had pledged themselves in the usual fashion by a secret bond. Mary's relatives in France wrote to her, as did also archbishop Beaton from Paris, entreating her to clear herself from complicity in the crime, and to do so by bringing the conspirators at once to condign punishment.² The earl of Lennox came forward and demanded judgment on the murderers of his son, reminding Mary in a pathetic letter of the duty she owed to the country, and to bear with him in troubling her Highness, he "being the fader to him that is gone."³ A collusive trial took place at an assize, and Bothwell was acquitted, his acquittal being confirmed by a Parliament largely composed of his own confederates, which met in April immediately after the trial.

On the evening that the Parliament rose, 19th April, Bothwell entertained his confederates at a banquet in Ainslie's tavern, where another secret bond—"Ainslie's

¹ Sir James Melvil's *Memoirs*, p. 155; Burton, *Hist.* iv. 190. Tytler, v. 384, says that Darnley's cries for mercy were heard by some women in the neighbouring house. Tytler also gives evidence of the penitence and devotion of the invalid king in his last days.

² See note in Robertson's *Statuta*, i. xii., quoting the unpublished letter from Father Thomas Innes to bishop Keith, dated Paris, 26th February 1731. "As to our bishops being concerned in the bond to Bothwell, though I would not answer for Sir

James Balfour's fidelity, from whom we have the transcript, you need not expect that I will be an apologist of the bishops of those times, except of one, that is archbishop Beaton, of whom we have an original in his own hand, being a minute of his letter to queen Mary against that infamous marriage. It is truly episcopal, and worthy of a great bishop." Beaton attributed Darnley's murder to queen Elizabeth.—Teulet, *Papiers d'Etat*, iii. 26.

³ Keith's *Affairs*, ii. 525.

bond"—was signed, declaring Bothwell's innocence of the king's murder, and recommending "this noble and mighty lord" as a suitable husband for the queen.¹ Five days after the date of this bond, Mary, who had been visiting her child at Stirling, was waylaid on her return at Almond bridge, between Linlithgow and Edinburgh, by Bothwell and his armed retainers, and carried to his castle at Dunbar.² Three short months after the death of Darnley, on the 15th of May, Mary was married to Bothwell in the Council Hall of Holyrood, by Adam Bothwell, protestant bishop of Orkney.³ Death would have been preferable to such a dishonourable union. Contemporary records reveal how utterly miserable the fallen queen was in her sense of shame. Melvil, whose fidelity to his royal mistress never wavered, reports: "I heard her ask for a knife to stab herself, or else, said she, I shall drown myself."⁴

Within a month it was all over, and Mary was a prisoner in Lochleven. The confederate lords, including several signers of the Ainslie bond, raised a sufficient force to march against Bothwell; and the queen, thankful to escape from an evil alliance, surrendered to Kirkaldy of Grange at Carberry Hill, six miles from Edinburgh, upon conditions which were not afterwards fulfilled,—no blame to Kirkaldy, who soon after became her devoted adherent, and continued so to the end of his life, which

¹ See Tytler, v. 401, and Keith's *Affairs*, ii. 565.

² Sir James Melvil's *Memoirs*, p. 158. Melvil was riding in the queen's company when the capture was made. He says that "Bothwell took her majesty's horse by the bridle, and that his men took the earl of Huntly, Lethington the secretary, and himself, and carried them captives to Dunbar, the rest being let go free."

³ The bishop had been canonically consecrated during the establishment of the papal hierarchy. He became a preacher, and a judge in the Court of Session. The marriage was, of course, after the Protestant form.—Keith's *Affairs*, ii. 554 note; Teulet, *Relations*, etc. ii. 294.

⁴ *Memoirs*, p. 161.

he sacrificed in her service.¹ Mary was taken to Edinburgh where she was insulted by the people in the streets, and especially, it is said, by the women and the soldiers.² On the 16th of June she entered on her brief imprisonment in Lochleven.

The Assembly which met on the 25th of June is memorable for the election of George Buchanan as moderator. His name has already been mentioned as the lampooner of the Franciscans in the reign of James V., and as one of the refugees who escaped from Scotland during the papal persecutions on the eve of the Reformation. Since then he had been on the Continent, in different lands, sharing various fortunes, including incarceration in a Portuguese prison where he wrote his Latin psalter. He was born in the Lennox about 1506, studied first in St. Andrews, and then in Paris where he became, in 1530, one of the four university procurators. His Latinity was marked by singular elegance of style, and he possessed an incomparable vein of poesy; in both respects he is said to have excelled all his contemporaries. His Latin version of the Psalms was dedicated to queen Mary, whom he clothed with many virtues, and eulogised as the *Nympha Caledoniæ*. The queen had invited him home, read the Latin classics with him at Holyrood, made him principal of St. Leonard's college, St. Andrews, and gave him from the temporal revenues of the abbey of Crossraguel an annual pension of 500 pounds Scots.³ When Mary fell upon evil days, Buchanan

¹ Skelton, in his spirited defence of Maitland of Lethington, writes with much appreciation of Kirkaldy, whom he describes as "the noblest man in Scotland, the mirror of chivalry." He went over to Mary's side after the production of the famous "Casket Letters," in the genuineness of which he evidently

had no faith. Skelton's *Maitland of Lethington*, ii. 288. For the "Casket Letters," see Skelton's *Mary Stuart*, pp. 120-133.

² Tytler, v. 427.

³ Irving's *Life of Buchanan*, 2nd ed. 1817, pp. 96, 123; *Historical Account of Family of Kennedy*, Pitcairn (Bannatyne Club), p. 92.

became her bitterest enemy, and wrote his political treatise, *De Jure Regni apud Scotos*, to justify the rebellion of her subjects. His history of Scotland was written in old age, when probably he lacked the necessary energy to sift out the mass of fabulous matter incorporated in the earlier histories.

The Assembly which elected Buchanan to the moderator's chair was adjourned for a month, and met again 21st July. The queen's lords were not present; representing the associated barons, known later as king's lords, there were the earls of Mar, Morton, Glencairn,¹ and the lords Ruthven, Lindsay, and Ochiltree, Maitland the secretary, and Kirkaldy of Grange. One conspicuous figure was absent, that of Moray who had betaken himself to France after his sister's hopeless entanglement with Bothwell, whom he hated and feared. The Assembly agreed once more to the Acts of Parliament that established the Protestant religion in 1560, renewed their resolutions to secure a proper provision for the reformed ministry out of the patrimony of the old Church, resolved that all sovereigns should, on their coronation, "make their faithful league and promise to the true kirk" to defend its religion in the manner prescribed in the books of Deuteronomy and Kings—which meant the extermination of "idolaters." It was also agreed to avenge the king's death, and to take precautions for bringing up the young prince James in the Protestant faith.²

The associated barons were meanwhile debating the

¹ As soon as the queen was out of Holyrood, Glencairn wrecked her private chapel. He was no prentice hand at the work of destruction, for he had been a great wrecker of "idolatry" in the west country, and

as great a plunderer of the "idolaters'" lands and heritages.

² Calderwood, ii. 377-384; *Book of Universal Kirk*, pp. 54-69; Knox, *Hist.* p. 358; Keith's *Affairs*, iii. 164-184; Tytler, v. 435.

thorny question, What was to be done with the queen? Most of them agreed to her deposition, a few proposed her confinement for life in a French convent, and others insisted upon bringing her at once to trial and execution. This last measure was warmly advocated by the protestant ministers, led by Knox, who had now returned from England, where he had been visiting his sons, both of whom were priests in the English Church.¹ The deposition of the queen was at last determined on, and the deeds of abdication were sent to Lochleven by lord Lindsay, a bitter puritan and personally obnoxious to the queen, who terrified her by threats until she hurriedly took the pen and signed the deed of abdication. It was on the 24th July 1567, and whether Mary realised it then or not, it was her farewell to the throne of Scotland.²

The earl of Moray, on being appointed regent during the infancy of the king, was called home to accept the office. At first he declined, with many professions of modesty in which few believed, for public rumour gave him credit for aiming still higher. Before visiting his sister in Lochleven the nobles "who did still bear a great love unto the queen prayed him in their name to behave himself gently and humbly unto the queen." Mary received him with tears, but instead of showing gentleness, to which even pity for her misfortunes, if not gratitude for her past favours, might have moved him, he reproached her bitterly with all her misdoings, and frightened her with the prospects of an ignominious death, until she was fain to entreat him as a brother to save her life and accept the regency.³ Moray returned to Edinburgh regent of Scotland, "leaving a heart like to break" in Lochleven. "The injuries of his

¹ Keith's *Affairs*, i. cx.-cxv., and ii. 655-716; Tytler, v. 444, 448, 449, 451.

² For lord Lindsay's conduct, see Skelton's *Mary Stuart*, p. 113.

³ Skelton's *Mary Stuart*, p. 113.

language was such," says Sir James Melvil,¹ "that they cut the thread of love and credit betwixt the queen and him for ever."²

¹ *Memoirs*, p. 174.

² Moray assured the French king that his object in returning to Scotland was to rescue queen Mary from imprisonment. Archbishop Beaton

said he had no faith in Moray's fair speech, that he was a great heretic, and the mortal enemy of his sister. —Teulet, *Papiers d'Etat*, iii. 36.

CHAPTER V

JAMES VI.—REGENCIES OF MORAY, LENNOX, AND MAR, 1567-1573

Coronation of prince James—Prosecution of Roman Catholics—Parliament of 1567 confirms Reformation settlement and Confession of Faith, makes provision for stipends—Assembly of 1567 deals with bishop Bothwell—Mary's escape from Lochleven—Battle of Langside—Mary a fugitive in England—Assembly's censorship of the press—Moray "reforming" Aberdeen University and burning witches—Degrading of Roman priests—Moray's plot against queen Mary—His assassination, career, and character—Lennox made regent—Meeting of Knox, Craig, and Winram, with Kirkaldy and Maitland in Edinburgh castle—Knox at St. Andrews—Capture of archbishop Hamilton in Dunbarton castle and his execution at Stirling—His character—Anomalous state of Church parties—Church lands, how they went—Erskine of Dun on the office of bishop—Convention of Leith and titular Episcopacy—Douglas made titular primate—John Knox and Episcopacy—Knox returns to Edinburgh—His last illness, death, and character—Edinburgh castle surrendered—Death of Maitland and execution of Kirkaldy—Morton regent.

IMMEDIATELY upon lord Lindsay's return from Lochleven with the deeds of abdication¹ signed by the queen, the associated barons hastened the coronation of the prince. He was crowned as James VI. in the parish church of Stirling, 29th July 1567, the anniversary of his parents' marriage, in the presence of five earls and twice as many barons, the only representatives present from the nobility.² The bishop of Orkney placed the crown on his head and

¹ The three deeds are given in Keith's *Affairs*, ii. 706-712.

² Teulet, *Relations Politiques*, ii. 336, 337.

anointed him, while the earl of Morton with his hand on the Gospels took the oaths for the sovereign. Knox had opposed the anointing as a Jewish ceremony, preaching on the crowning of Joash and the slaughter of Athaliah—a very bad type of queen-mother, and suggestive of inferences. Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, the English ambassador, was present at Knox's preaching and made the following remark upon it: "This day being at Mr. Knox's sermon who took a piece of the Scripture forth of the Books of the Kings and did inveigh vehemently against the Queen, and persuaded extremities towards her by application of his text."¹ The ambassador suggested to some members of the Council that they should advise the preachers not to intermeddle with State politics, but the Council knew better than to offer any such advice to the preachers, and especially to the intrepid Knox.²

The earl of Moray, after his interview with Mary, accepted the regency which, according to his own account, she passionately urged upon him. The queen in her subsequent "Appeal to all Christian princes" represents that she earnestly dissuaded him from accepting the office.³ If Moray had ambition he had also some ability to sustain it; and but for the political factions which had long been the bane of Scotland, the country might have prospered under his rule. The larger section of the nobility were, however, hostile to him, some from jealousy of his advancement, some from loyalty to Mary. The few remaining nobles and the Protestant ministers composed the king's party which warmly supported Moray. He had also at his back the political influence of England which continued a potent factor in Scottish politics.

¹ Letter given in Keith's *Affairs*, ii. 687.

² Burton, *Hist.* iv. 284, 285.

³ The "Appeal" was written at Carlisle in 1568.

The beginning of Moray's regency was marked by a prosecution of the Roman Catholics.¹ Bishop Chisholm of Dunblane, and several prelates and priests were summoned to answer for the crime of saying and hearing mass. The bishop was further accused of "passing forth of this country without licence, and trafficking with the pope's nuncio and other his ministers," which was a matter of public notoriety, for the bishop had been indefatigable at home and abroad in the interests of the queen and the papacy. The bishop was deprived of his see and all its property, and his tenants and feuars were forbidden to make him any further payments "under pain of being held art and part with him in his wicked deeds and enormities." Various punishments were imposed upon the priests who appeared for trial, and those who did not appear were sentenced to outlawry and forfeiture.²

The Parliament met in Edinburgh 15th December 1567 for the despatch of important business. Maitland of Lethington, who was still in accord with Moray, made an able speech, more remarkable, according to Tytler,³ for its talent than for its truthfulness. He praised the Scottish Reformation as being devoid of bloodshed, and contrasted it with the sanguinary struggles for religious freedom in England and on the Continent. On proceeding to business the Parliament accepted the queen's abdication, sanctioned the king's coronation and the regency of Moray, abolished once more the authority of the pope, confirmed the Confession of Faith, re-imposed the penalties of confiscation, banishment, and death for

¹ The regent had sworn, "Out of this realm of Scotland, I shall root out all heretics and enemies to the true worship of God."

² Teulet, *Papiers d'Etat*, iii. 31; *Register Priv. Council*, i. 569, and ii. 40.

³ *Hist.* vi. 24, 25.

the saying and hearing of mass, declared the Church **now** established to be the only true Church, "the immaculate spouse of Christ." In confirmation of this, it decreed that no one should hereafter practise as procurator or notary in any court until he had made profession of the reformed faith. The ancient coronation oath, first imposed by papal bull in the last year of king Robert Bruce, to maintain the true Church and to extirpate heresy, was also approved by Parliament as it had previously been by the Assembly.¹

The Parliament also dealt with the stipends of the ministers who had come (as stated in the preamble of the statute) "to such great poverty that unless speedily relieved they would be obliged to abandon their ministry." It was therefore enacted "that the hail thirds of the hail benefices of this realm sall now instantly, and in all time to come, first be paid to the ministers of the evangel of Jesus Christ, and their successors." This was intended merely as a temporary measure to relieve the present necessities of the ministers, and was only to last until "the kirk come to the full possession of their proper patrimony, quhilk is the teinds."² The full patri-

¹ *Acts Parl. Scot.* iii. 3-25; Keith's *Affairs*, iii. 184-186; Spottiswoode, *Hist.* ii. 83; Calderwood, ii. 388-392; Tytler, vi. 24-27; Burton, iv. 290. The coronation oath, with its exterminating clause, which was here taken in the name of James VI., was used on the coronation of Charles I. in 1633, and of Charles II. in 1651; and on this last occasion another oath was imposed to maintain the National Covenant, and the Solemn League and Covenant which bound its adherents to extirpate popery and prelacy. James VII. and II. of England declined the coronation oath. William

III. objected to its persecuting clause, and only accepted it with mental reservations. Queen Anne, the last sovereign of the house of Stuart, accepted it without scruple or reserve. After the Union of the Parliaments a more moderate declaration was substituted, "which happily relieved all following princes from the wickedness and mockery of a cruel and impossible obligation." Robertson's *Statuta*, p. xlvii. *seq.* Bellesheim, *Hist.* iii. 156, refers to the persecuting oath of 1567, but is judiciously silent as to its papal origin in 1329.

² *Act. Parl. Scot.* iii. 37; *Book of the Universal Kirk*, p. 107.

mony of the Church would have included the other temporalities as well as the tithes, but the ministers would gladly have compounded for a punctual payment of their thirds, which were now promised, but never paid, in full. In an Assembly of this year the protestations of the poverty of "kirkmen" were subscribed by about eighty of the most notorious impropiators of Church lands.¹ They were ready as usual to sign protestations, but none the less prepared to stand by their spoil and to let the ministers struggle on in their poverty. Some of the ministers' friends memorialised the regent, in August 1571, complaining that the temporal substance of the Church had all fallen into the hands of "dumb dogs."²

In the Assembly which met in Edinburgh at Christmas 1567, the superintendent of Fife and the bishops of Orkney and Caithness were admonished for neglecting visitation and for other offences. The bishop of Orkney was further dealt with for acting as a judge in the Court of Session "while his sheep were wandering without a pastor"; for keeping company with Sir Francis Bothwell, a papist, and giving him benefices; and lastly for solemnising the marriage of the queen and the earl of Bothwell—this last act being so flagrant in the Assembly's eyes that it was not purged by the bishop's subsequent pursuit, along with Kirkaldy of Grange, of the fugitive Bothwell in Orkney.³ The bishop was sentenced to be deprived of office until he made suitable satisfaction and public profession of penitence in Holyrood chapel.⁴ The earl of Argyll was also summoned and rebuked for non-conjugal relations with his wife, and his countess was at the same

¹ Burton, iv. 324.

² Bannatyne's *Memorials of Transactions in Scot.* p. 251.

³ For an account of this pursuit see

Spottiswoode, *Hist.* ii. 71-80.

⁴ *Book of the Univ. Kirk*, pp. 70-73; Keith's *Affairs*, iii. 186-198; Calderwood, pp. 392-401.

time "ordained to make public repentance in the chapel-royal of Stirling upon ane Sunday in time of preaching" for having been present at the popish baptism of prince James.¹ The Assembly exercised its authority as a judicial court with impartial rigour, sparing neither prelate nor peer in its discipline.

The regent was energetic in restoring law and order ; but not so energetic as justice demanded in prosecuting the murderers of Darnley. This task was both difficult and hazardous ; for several of the nobles, who were now his prominent supporters, had been leaders in the conspiracy. Instead of aiming at the heads of "the band" he executed some of the subordinates, which only incensed public feeling against him. While his popularity was thus waning, news spread like wildfire that the queen had escaped from Lochleven. On a Sunday evening, 1st May 1568, Mary added to the romance of her life by effecting her escape, and next day was with her friends at Hamilton.² The regent was then in Glasgow, and soon gave proof that his powers were equal to the emergency by concentrating, in a week's time, troops sufficient to win the battle of Langside. Mary had wished to reach Dunbarton castle, once her temporary abode when as a guileless girl she was on her way to France, and still held by friends in her interest ;³ but the road was barred by the regent's troops, and the attempt to reach the castle brought on the engagement at Langside on 13th May, when the queen witnessed the final overthrow of her cause in Scotland. She is said now for the first time in her life to have lost her personal courage. Without slackening rein she rode on until she reached Dundrennan abbey by the Solway, sixty miles from the battlefield, intending to throw herself upon the

¹ *Book of Univ. Kirk*, p. 310.

² Teulet, *Papiers d'Etat*, iii. 41.

³ Teulet, *Relations Politiques*, ii.

343 ; *Papiers d'Etat*, iii. 42.

promised protection of Elizabeth — a hasty and fatal resolve.¹

The Assembly which met in Edinburgh, July 1568, exercised, not for the first time, an ecclesiastical censorship over the press. Thomas Bassandyne, a printer, was charged with publishing a profane ballad in an edition of the Psalm Book, and with an offence still more obnoxious, the publishing of a book, entitled *The Fall of the Roman Kirk*, in which he spoke of the king as "supreme head of the primitive Church." On this subject the Assembly was keenly sensitive, and repudiated the nascent Erastianism of the age. The Assembly ordered Bassandyne "not to print without licence of the supreme magistrate, and revising of such things as pertain to religion by some of the kirk appointed to that purpose."² In 1574, in pursuance of the same object, it appointed a standing Committee "to oversee all manner of books or works that shall be proposed to be printed, and to give their judgment thereupon if the same be allowed and approved by the law of God or not; their judgment or opinion thereof, by their superscription and handwrit, to witness and testify for the relief of such as shall read the said works."³

The Assembly of 1568 also petitioned the regent for the reform of Aberdeen University, which Moray took in hand in the following year. The principal, Alexander

¹ Mary wrote to Elizabeth on the 15th May, two days after the battle, from Workington in Cumberland—"I am now forced out of my kingdom, and driven to such straits that, next to God, I have no hope but in your goodness. It is my earnest request that your majesty will send for me as soon as possible, for my condition is pitiable, not to say for a queen, but even for a simple gentlewoman. I have no other dress than that in which I escaped from the

field; my first day's ride was sixty miles across the country, and I have not since dared to travel except by night." Tytler, vi. 45; Teulet, *Relations Politiques*, ii. 370. When at Carlisle queen Mary asked lord Scrope for a priest to say mass, and he assured her there was not one in England.—Teulet, *Papiers*, etc. iii. 49.

² *Book of Univ. Kirk*, p. 126.

³ *Ibid.* p. 310.

Anderson, and the other officials were required to sign the Confession of Faith and the Acts of Parliament, 1560 and 1567, establishing the Protestant religion. Upon their refusal they were deprived of office.¹ The regent further signalled his zeal for the reformed faith on this occasion by burning witches at St. Andrews and Dundee.² Four Roman priests of Dunblane were, about this time, sentenced to death for saying mass, but were more fortunate than the witches in having their sentence commuted by the regent to something less painful, if not less ignominious. Vested in their priestly robes, and bearing missal and chalice in their hands, they were fastened to the market cross of Stirling where "the people cast eggs and other villainy at their faces by the space of an hour, and thereafter their vestments and chalices were burnt to ashes."³ Humiliating as the spectacle must have been, there was still an element of clemency in it as compared with the papal method of dealing with heretics, in which something more vital was wont to be burned than goodly raiment and silver vessels.

The regent was very complacent to the Assembly and the Assembly to the regent, and both no doubt from conscientious motives. Moray had the reformed religion at heart, and was a consistent supporter of it throughout. He needed at this stage all the support that the ministers could bring him, for the Hamiltons and other leading families were becoming more hostile to his government; and two leading men, who had been Moray's friends in council for many years, Maitland the ablest statesman, and Kirkaldy the most capable soldier of their day, were estranged from the regent and joined the queen's party.

¹ *Book of Univ. Kirk*, pp. 111-117.

³ *History of King James the Sixth*, p. 66.

² *Diurnal of Occurrents*, p. 145

His enemies accused Moray of a design to usurp the crown; and a satirical squib, printed after his death, gave point to the accusation in a series of burlesque dialogues put into the mouths of Knox and others, professing to urge Moray to assume the sceptre. The author was Thomas Maitland, the secretary's brother, whom Knox attacked in the pulpit, and prophetically doomed to a bad end.

There is no evidence of the regent's complicity in any such design, but there is evidence of his plot, 2nd January 1570, to have queen Mary delivered into his hands, in exchange for the earl of Northumberland who was then a refugee in Scotland.¹ Knox wrote an enigmatical letter to Cecil, the English secretary, on the same subject, in which he says, "Danger known should be avoided. If ye strike not at the root, the branches that appear to be broken will bud again, and that more quickly than men can believe, with greater force than we could wish. . . . In haste, of Edinburgh, the second of Janur.—Yours to command in God, John Knox, with his one foot in the grave."²

The machinations against Mary were exposed by bishop Leslie, her faithful friend, who protested to queen Elizabeth that the delivery of his royal mistress into Moray's hands would be tantamount to signing her death-warrant.³ The proceedings were suddenly arrested by the assassination of the regent as he was passing through Linlithgow, 23rd of January 1570. He was apprised of his danger; and it had been intended to avoid the narrow main street by a more circuitous route, but the street once entered, the regent rode slowly on account of the crowd,

¹ *State Papers Scot.* vol. xvi. No. 88, vol. xvii. No. 2.

² *State Papers Scot. Elis.* vol. xvii. No. 3.

³ Leslie was, a year afterwards, prisoner in the Tower of London.—Teulet, *Relations Politiques*, ii. 427.

so that the assassin, Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh, had time enough to make sure of his aim. The wound proved mortal, and Moray died within a few hours in Linlithgow palace. Hamilton, who fled to the Low Countries after his atrocious deed, had been exasperated into revenge by sentence of outlawry and forfeiture, but his act was none the less the outcome of a wide conspiracy against the regent's life.

Moray was born in 1530, and was thus in his fortieth year when he met his untimely death. He had been a conspicuous figure in public life for twenty years, from his first appearance as the youthful lay-prior of St. Andrews, when he took part in the last Councils of the mediæval Church, onwards to the day that the assassin's bullet ended his regency. His personal piety, his consistent advocacy of the Reformation, and his respectable abilities have not been questioned except by the bitterest partisans. Sir James Melvil in his *Memoirs* more than once speaks of him as the good regent, while regretting that he was so "facile" to the advice of flatterers and place hunters. On the other hand, his pocketing through all his life the large emoluments of an ecclesiastical office in the Roman Church, which he heartily repudiated; his being a pensioner of the English Government ceaselessly plotting against his own country, his betrayal of Norfolk and desertion of his friends, and his unnatural conduct to his sister and sovereign, especially in connection with the production of the Casket Letters, must be weighed and reckoned in any candid review of his character.¹ The body of the earl was buried amidst many indications of national sorrow in St. Anthony's aisle within St. Giles' church, Knox preaching a eulogistic sermon on the "Good Regent."²

The usual strife of factions between the king's party

¹ Skelton's *Mary Stuart* pp. 48, 74, 75. ² Tytler, vi. 117.

and the queen's followed the death of Moray. Mary's friends were now in the ascendant, and probably would have triumphed, but for the invasion of the country by two English armies simultaneously under lords Sussex and Scrope. To the distraction of civil war were thus added the miseries of foreign invasion. The election of the earl of Lennox to the regency by the king's party in July 1570—an elevation which he owed entirely to his relationship to the young king—did not abate the disorders of the time. Lennox had not the vigour and capacity of Moray, and his election was at once challenged by the queen's adherents. Meanwhile the English government, true to its character as the marplot of Scotland, continued to play off the one faction against the other, and to embroil the country in deeper dissension.

Kirkaldy of Grange was now governor of Edinburgh castle, which he held for the queen.¹ For this Knox reviled him as a cut-throat and murderer; and the soldier retaliated by stigmatising the preacher as a shedder of innocent blood, backing his words by occasional salvoes of artillery from the castle. The capital began to fill with the queen's supporters, and Knox, who was in feeble health from an attack of apoplexy in the previous October, found that the city was getting too hot for him. On the advice of his friends he withdrew to St. Andrews, a city which to him had mixed associations. Before quitting Edinburgh, Knox, with Craig his colleague, and Winram superintendent of Fife, had a conference within the castle with Kirkaldy and Maitland—strange as it may seem from the strained relations of the men. The discussion touched deep problems of Church and State, in which their agreement was impossible, but the tension between them was so far relaxed that they joined at one

¹ Teulet, *Papiers d'Etat*, iii. 125.

point in a merry laugh. It was the last time that Knox and his former allies looked each other in the face.¹

The picture of the aged Reformer in his retreat by the cold north sea is one of the most pleasing in all his stormy life. It is drawn by the friendly pen of young James Melville, then a student of St. Leonard's college. "Of all the benefits," he writes,² "that I had that year (1571), was the coming of that most notable prophet and apostle of our nation, Mr. John Knox, to St. Andrews, who, by the faction of the queen occupying the castle and town of Edinburgh, was compelled to remove therefrom, with a number of the best, and chose to come to St. Andrews. I heard him teach there the prophecies of Daniel that summer and the winter following. I had my pen and my little book, and took away such things as I could comprehend. In the opening up of his text, he was moderate, the space of half an hour; but when he entered on application he made me so to grew (shudder) and tremble that I could not hold a pen to write. . . . He was very weak. I saw him, every day of his doctrine, go hylie and fear (slowly and warily) with a furring of marticks about his neck, a staff in the one hand and good godly Richard Ballanden, his servant, holding up the other oxter (armpit) from the abbey to the parish kirk, and, by the said Richard and another servant, lifted up to the pulpit where he behoved to lean at his first entry; but ere he had done with his sermon, he was so active and vigorous that he was like to ding the pulpit in blads (splinters) and fly out of it."

There is a less favourable sketch of Knox in St. Andrews from the pen of his own secretary, Bannatyne,

¹ Bannatyne's *Memorials*, octavo ed. pp. 156-168; Burton, *Hist.* v. 55-62.

² From Melville's MS. Diary, pp. 22, 28, in M'Crie's *Life of Knox*, ii. 205, 206.

who records that Knox by his sermons "generated unto him a deadly hatred and envy of all the aforesaid in St. Andrews, and especially the principals of the new College and the old, a few excepted ;" and that when he left St. Andrews it was "not without dolour and displeasure of the few godly that were in that town but to the great joy and pleasure of the rest."¹

The now familiar bishop of Orkney, Adam Bothwell, was again brought up before the Assembly on various charges — neglecting his diocese, assuming the title Father in God ("which belongs not," as he was reminded, "to a minister of Christ"), discharging the duties of a lord of Session, simoniacally exchanging his bishopric for the abbacy of Holyrood, and allowing the church fabrics to fall into decay. The bishop pleaded that the climate of Orkney was to him unendurable, that he was still diligent in preaching, that the churches had been pulled down at the Reformation and were exactly as that storm had left them, and that his exchange of his bishopric for the abbacy was due to the violence of its lay abbot, lord Robert Stewart. The bishop's career had not hitherto been blameless, though he is not an unfair specimen of the Scots Roman prelate turned Protestant.²

The castle of Dunbarton, which lord Fleming held for the queen, was captured on 2nd April 1571, by Captain Craufurd of Jordan Hill, an officer and kinsman of the regent Lennox. The Governor made good his escape, but among the prisoners who fell into the regent's hands was the archbishop (Hamilton) of St. Andrews, who was found clad in mail shirt and steel cap. There was a standing feud between the houses of Lennox and Hamilton, and the Lennox grudge was gratified by the primate's

¹ Bannatyne's *Memorials*, pp. 364, 373, 374; *Book of Universal Kirk*, p. 247.

² Burton, v. 459.

execution. He was taken to Stirling, accused of being privy to the murders of Darnley and Moray, of which he solemnly asserted his innocence ; and within three days from his capture, without even the semblance of a judicial trial, which he demanded, he was hung in his episcopal robes on the common gibbet of the town. One deed of blood begets another, and the regent paid the price for this revenge not many months afterwards in the same town of Stirling.¹

Apart from the question of his complicity in the murders, the private life of archbishop Hamilton had been very discreditable. Possessed of average abilities, thrust into high offices by family influence, unweariedly devoted to the papacy which he served faithfully after a fashion, his incontinence had long been a public scandal, a disgrace to any form of the Christian religion, and one of many similar cases that undermined the papacy in Scotland.

John Hamilton was the last Roman archbishop of St. Andrews. The Roman Catholic members of the chapter elected a priest named Robert Hay as his successor ; but though he professed to act in that capacity, he was never consecrated, and the Roman see made no attempt to resuscitate the papal hierarchy in Scotland for three hundred years—not until the 4th March 1878. The earl of Morton had, before Hamilton's death, received from the regent the patronage of the primacy, and being bent on the restoration of the episcopal order he presented John Douglas, rector of the University of St. Andrews, to the archbishopric.

The ecclesiastical condition of Scotland at this time

¹ For archbishop Hamilton, see *Diurnal of Occurrents*, pp. 204, 205 ; Spottiswoode, *Hist.* ii. 155, 156 ; Calderwood, iii. 54, 59 ; Tytler, vi. 153, 154. See also Tytler, vii. 140,

for MS. letter from Throckmorton to Leicester on archbishop Hamilton's cruel proposal to put queen Mary to death.

was very anomalous. The bishops and abbots of the Roman faith, though driven from the altar, still retained their seats in Parliament and continued to be the first of the Three Estates of the realm—the peers spiritual; and not only so, but when the bishops changed their creed, like Bothwell of Orkney and Gordon of Galloway, and became protestant bishops, or when laymen usurped a bishopric or an abbacy, the ecclesiastical title, no matter who held it or how it was obtained, empowered the possessor to sit in Parliament and to draw the revenues of his benefice,—to enjoy, in short, every temporal privilege without necessarily performing any spiritual duty. The balance of the constitution, so it was argued, required the preservation of the Three Estates, and therefore the Church must be represented in the national senate by prelates, real or titular. The regent Moray, for example, enjoyed all the privileges, political and pecuniary, of the rich priory of St. Andrews for more than thirty years; and so accustomed had men become to the misappropriation, that after Moray's death queen Mary bestowed the priory upon Kirkaldy of Grange, though it was probably little more to him than an empty title. This provoked from Randolph, at one time English ambassador, and an old college friend of Kirkaldy, the facetious letter in which he says, "Brother William, it was indeed most wonderful unto me when I heard that you should become a prior. That vocation agreeth not with anything that ever I knew in you, saving for your religious life under the cardinal's hat, when we were both students in Paris."¹

A similar difficulty arose as to the titles of ecclesiastical lands and heritages. The bishops, abbots, and other

¹ Letter from State Paper Office, dated 1st May 1570, cited by Tytler, vi. 139.

beneficed clergy, in whom the properties were vested *ex officiis*, were gradually dying out; and the question had to be settled, Who was to give titles to the tenants and feuars of the old Church lands? The Parliament of August 1571 cut the knot by enacting that they should be held henceforth direct from the Crown. The statute made a quiet revolution in the possession of large tracts of land; but many of the nobility and gentry were sufficiently sharp-witted to anticipate the legislation of the Crown by private appropriation. There was a selfish scramble all round for every ecclesiastical acre not already disposed of. The protestant ministers who had been loud in denouncing the territorial magnates of the papal Church were now equally clamorous for their share in the Church lands. The scoffs of the lordly appropriators was all that they got for their pains. "The lords, Morton in special, who ruled all, said he should lay their pride and put order to them, with many other injurious words."¹ The reforming earl of Glencairn, already laden with ecclesiastical plunder, sought the archbishopric of Glasgow, and, because it was denied him, refused to sit in Parliament;² and the earl of Argyll, who had the lion's share of three bishoprics,—Brechin, Argyll, and the Isles,³—besides monastic spoils not accurately known, was credited at this period with deserting the queen's party for the king's, induced by a bribe of Church lands. "The greedy and insatiable appetite of benefices was the most cause thereof, for in his time there was none brought under the king's obedience but for reward either given or promised."⁴

The regent Lennox was killed at Stirling, 4th

¹ Bannatyne's *Memorials*, p. 254.

little later.

² *Diurnal of Occurrents*, 1570.

⁴ *Diurnal of Occurrents*, 1571.

³ He added a fourth, Dunkeld, a

September 1571, in a fray instigated by the earl of Huntly and lord Claud Hamilton. It was the Hamilton revenge for the archbishop's murder. Next day the earl of Mar was made regent. The choice lay between him and Morton or Argyll. Morton was by far the ablest of the three, and had been the life and soul of the Government for some years; but he was avaricious in spirit, immoral in life, and not very scrupulous about ways and means. Mar was an amiable man, and his character for honesty stood higher than that of any other noble in those profligate times.¹

John Douglas, rector of St. Andrews University, had been made titular archbishop of that see by the influence of Morton; and other vacant bishoprics had been filled in like manner without consulting the Assembly. This action was like to provoke a conflict between Church and State; and Erskine of Dun, superintendent of Angus, to avoid a rupture, wrote to the regent, 10th November 1571, a pacific letter, which is remarkable for the opinions expressed by the veteran Reformer. "As to the provision of benefices," Erskine says, "this is my judgment: all benefices of tithes, or having tithes joined or annexed thereto, which are taken out of the people's labours, have the offices joined to them, which office is the preaching of the Evangel and ministration of the sacraments; and this office is spiritual, and therefore belongs to the kirk, which only has the distribution and ministration of spiritual things. So by the kirk spiritual offices are distributed, and men received and admitted thereto, and the administration of the power is committed by the kirk to bishops or superintendents; wherefore to the bishops and superintendents pertains the examination and admission of men unto benefices and offices of spiritual cure, what

¹ Tytler, vi. 163.

soever benefice it be, as well bishoprics, abbacies, and priories, as other inferior benefices. That this pertains by the Scriptures of God to the bishop or superintendent is manifest. . . . We have expressed plainly by Scripture, that to the office of a bishop pertain examination and admission into spiritual cure and office, and also to oversee them that are admitted, that they walk uprightly, and exercise their office faithfully and purely. To take this power from the bishop or superintendent is to take away the office of a bishop, that no bishop be in the kirk."

Erskine wrote another letter on the 14th November to the regent who had intimated a meeting of superintendents and other ministers to be held at Leith, with a view to settle the Church's polity. The regent in his reply to Erskine writes, "Truly our meaning was, and still is, to procure the reforming of things disordered in all sorts, as far as may be, retaining the privilege of the king, crown, and patronage. The default of the whole stands in this, that the policy of the kirk of Scotland is not perfect, nor any solid conference among godly men that are well-willed and of judgment how the same may be helped; and for corruption, which daily increases, whensoever the circumstances of things shall be well considered by the good ministers that are neither busy nor over desirous of promotions to them and theirs, it will be found that some have been authors and procurers of things that no good policy in the kirk can allow; wherant we thought to have conferred specially with yourself, and to have yielded to you in things reasonable, and craved satisfaction of other things alike reasonable at your hands and by your procurement."¹

¹ Letters of Erskine and Mar given in Bannatyne's *Transactions*, pp. 279-293; and in Calderwood's *Hist.* iii.

156-165. Erskine was a kinsman of the regent Mar, whose family name was Erskine.

To procure a settlement of the polity of the Church and of its relations with the State, several conferences were held at Leith, in December 1571, between the regent and Council on the one hand, and the superintendents and ministers on the other. A more formal meeting was convened at the same place on 12th January 1572, of superintendents, commissioners, and ministers. It was known as the CONVENTION OF LEITH, and, though not a regular Assembly, it was to have "the strength, force, and effect of a General Assembly."

The religious condition of the country at this time is described in a remarkable sermon preached at the Convention before the regent and nobility by David Ferguson, minister of Dunfermline. "This day," said the preacher, "Christ is spoiled amongst us, while that which ought to maintain the ministry of the Church and the poor is given to profane men, flatterers in court, ruffians, and hirelings; the poor in the meantime oppressed with hunger, the churches and temples decaying for the lack of ministers and upholding, and the schools utterly neglected. But now to speak of your temples where the word of God should be preached and the sacraments administered, all men see to what miserable ruin and decay they are come; yea, they are so profaned, that in my conscience if I had been brought up in Germany, or in any other country where Christ is truly preached, and all things done decently and in order, according to God's word, and had heard of that purity of religion which is among you, and for the love thereof had taken travel to visit this land, and then should have seen the foul deformity and desolation of your churches and temples, which are more like sheep-cots than the house of God, I could not have judged that there had been any fear of God or right religion in the most part of this

realm. And as for the ministers of the word, they are utterly neglected and come in manifest contempt among you. Ye rail upon them at your pleasure. Of their doctrine, if it serve not your turn, and agree not with your appetites, ye are become impatient. And, to be short, we are now made your table talk, whom ye mock in your mirth, and threaten in your anger. This is what moves me (let men judge as they list) to lay before your eyes the miserable state of the poor Church of Scotland, that thereby ye may be provoked to pity it, and to restore the things that unjustly you spoiled it of.”¹

The Convention appointed a commission of its members to meet with a committee of the Privy Council, and draw up conjointly a working concordat on the ecclesiastical polity of the Church and the sustentation of its ministers. Representing the Church there was Erskine, superintendent of Angus; Winram, superintendent of Fife; William Lundie, of that ilk; Mr. John Craig, Knox's colleague in St. Giles'; and three other commissioners. The Council appointed the earl of Morton chancellor, lord Ruthven treasurer, the bishop of Orkney, and four other members,—both committees being fairly representative of the different parties in Church and State. On the 1st February they framed a series of articles, of which the following is the substance: (1) That the titles of archbishops and bishops, and the boundaries of dioceses, should remain as before the Reformation, at the least till the king on attaining his majority, or the Parliament, should otherwise determine; that a chapter of learned

¹ Tracts by David Ferguson, minister of Dunfermline (Bannatyne Club) p. 72 *et seq.* John Knox subscribed his name in approval of this sermon, signing the document after the new archbishop of St. Andrews, Erskine

and Winram, superintendents, and Chrysteson, minister of Dundee,—Knox adding “with my dead hand but glaid heart praising God that of His mercy He levis such light to His Kirk in this desolation.”

ministers should be attached to each cathedral ; that the archbishops and bishops should have no more authority than superintendents, and that they should be subject to the Assembly. (2) That abbots, priors, and commendators should be learned and suitable for their office, and tried and admitted by the bishops ; that provisions should first be made out of their benefices for the support of the ministers, and that commendators should be qualified to act as senators in the College of Justice. (3) That the king, the universities, and the lay patrons should possess their several rights of patronage ; that only qualified persons, of at least twenty-three years of age, be appointed ministers ; that readers be admitted by the bishops or superintendents to solemnise marriage, and to baptize and to hold benefices up to the yearly value of forty pounds ; and that all ministers reside within their parish, sign the Confession of Faith, and take the oath of allegiance to the king before admission. (4) That all deaneries, provostries of collegiate churches, prebends, and chaplaincies, founded on temporal lands, be bestowed by their patrons on students in grammar, arts, theology, law, or medicine.

The articles also give directions as to the manner of electing a bishop,—by letter under the great seal to the dean and chapter,—and prescribe the form of oath which the bishop is to take on his election, acknowledging the king as “the only lawful and supreme governor of this realm, as well in things temporal as in the conservation and purgation of religion.” Whereupon the bishop was to receive letters under the privy seal restoring to him the temporalities of his see.¹

The regent approved of the Concordat, and it was to

¹ Calderwood, iii. 172-179 ; Spottiswoode, ii. 171, 172 ; *Book of the Universal Kirk*, p. 130.

be submitted to Parliament for confirmation. The General Assembly which met in Perth in August of this year also gave its consent, but with evident reluctance, and only accepting it as a temporary measure "until further and more perfect order be obtained at the hands of his majesty's regent and nobility, for the which they will press as occasion shall serve." In future sederunts of the Assemblies the bishops take precedence of superintendents; and in the Assembly of August 1574 the members petition the regent to fill up vacant bishoprics with qualified persons.¹

Looking back upon the First Book of Discipline with its severe strictures upon prelacy in all its forms, the Concordat of Leith marks an unexpected revolution of the ecclesiastical wheel. The restored Episcopate was in outward respects similar to the hierarchy of the reformed Anglican Church, and to the hierarchy abolished by the Scots Parliament twelve years before, barring the supremacy of the pope. The sanction of the Crown, the election by the chapter, the act of consecration were all duly prescribed. It is when we examine the episcopal character of the consecrators that the flaw appears. No man can convey to others gifts of any kind, sacred or secular, which he has not himself received. The men who, during this transition, professed to ordain others to the episcopal office had not themselves been validly ordained to any ministerial office. The principle of the historic Episcopate is, and has always been, that only a bishop, himself validly ordained, can ordain to any office in the ministry. Tested by this qualification the men appointed to the office of bishop under the Leith Concordat, however worthy of the honour, were mere titular bishops devoid of any episcopal character. At the

¹ *Book of the Universal Kirk, 1574, 1575.*

same time, this titular Episcopate affords one more proof that the Church of that age, if it was not properly episcopal in polity, was at least nominally episcopal, and by no means presbyterial in parity.

The first ordination of a bishop under the new order was that of John Douglas to the primacy of St. Andrews. The bishop of Caithness, brother of the late regent Lennox, Spottiswoode, superintendent of Lothian, and David Lindsay, minister at Leith, laid their hands on the bishop-elect, and he became titular archbishop of St. Andrews. It is doubtful whether any of the three men had received even the order of the priesthood. The election of Douglas was opposed by many members of the chapter; and Patrick Adamson, said by Calderwood¹ to have been a disappointed claimant, preached against it in a sermon in which he said there were three sorts of bishops—"My lord bishop, my lord's bishop, and the Lord's bishop. My lord bishop was in the time of Papestrie; my lord's bishop is now, when my lord getteth the benefice, and the bishop serveth for a portion out of the benefice, to make my lord's title sure; the Lord's bishop is the true minister of the Gospel."² Adamson lived to succeed Douglas in the archbishopric, and under the steady influence of the mitre modified his language; but his witticism pointed to the prevalent belief that there had been a simoniacal paction between Douglas and his patron, the earl of Morton. John Knox, who was still in St. Andrews, took the same view of the pluralism of Douglas, who besides being rector of the University and provost of St. Mary's college, now became primate of the Scottish Church. He was far advanced in years, and Knox deprecated the laying of so much additional responsibility on a decrepit old

¹ *Hist.* iii. 206.

who is the only contemporary authority

² *Diary*, p. 32, of James Melville,

for Adamson's witticism.

man.¹ Knox refused to attend the archbishop's inauguration; but he preached in the hearing of Morton, and pronounced anathema both on the giver and the receiver of the office.²

While Knox condemned the election of Douglas to the primacy for the reasons given, he was not opposed to the restoration of the Episcopate as agreed upon in the Leith Convention.³ Too infirm to attend the Assembly of August 1572, Knox sent a letter with a series of articles, in which he made the following suggestions: "That no gift of any bishopric or other benefice be given to any person contrary to the tenor of the acts made in the time of the first regent of good memory . . . and that all bishoprics vacant may be presented, and qualified persons nominated thereunto, within one year of the vacancy thereof, according to the order taken in Leith by the commissioners of the nobility and of the kirk in the month of January last. And, in special, to complain upon the giving of the bishopric of Ross to the lord Methwene.⁴ . . . That no pensions of benefices be given by simple donation of my lord regent without the consent of the possessors of the benefices and the admission of the superintendent . . . or of the bishops lawfully elected according to the said order taken in Leith. . . . That an act be made decerning and ordaining all bishops admitted by order of the kirk, now received, to give account of their whole rents and intromissions therewith, once in the year, as the kirk shall appoint."⁵ These extracts, and

¹ "I heard Mr. Knox speak against him," says Melville (*Diary*, p. 31), "but sparingly, because he loved him; and with regret saying, 'Alas for pity to lay upon an auld weak man's back that whilk twenty of the best gifts could not bear! It will wrack him and disgrace him.'"

² Calderwood, iii. 206.

³ See Cunningham's *Hist.* i. 429.

⁴ Lord Methven was shortly afterwards killed in the High Street of Edinburgh by a shot from the castle.

⁵ Bannatyne's *Transactions*, pp. 366, 367.

the general tenor of the document, indicate that Knox accepted the episcopal office as the Kirk had accepted it, while he attacked, and with good reason, the avaricious spirit of patrons like Morton, who in the course of ten years made the titular Episcopacy a reproach and a byword.¹

In July 1572 there was a truce between the contending factions in Edinburgh, and Knox was invited to return to the capital, which he did by slow stages in the month of August. But he was no longer the man that he had been. Killigrew, the English envoy, who saw him daily, writes—"John Knox is now so feeble as scarce can he stand alone, or speak to be heard of any audience; yet doth he every Sunday cause himself to be carried to a place, where a certain number do hear him, and preacheth with the same vehemency and zeal that he ever did."² The smaller place fitted up for Knox was the Tolbooth Church, where he continued to preach down to Sunday, 9th November, when he inducted James Lawson as his colleague and successor. This was the last public appearance of John Knox.

The country had been shocked in the beginning of September by news from France of the horrible massacre, on St. Bartholomew's day, of over ten thousand Huguenots. While the pope was offering a solemn thanksgiving for the destruction of his heretical enemies, Scotsmen and Englishmen of all creeds were horror stricken. It was one of those bloody triumphs more disastrous to Rome than many defeats. Knox in his enfeebled health was deeply affected by the event, and all the more that some

¹ Burton, *Hist.* v. 79, remarks that at this period "the question of Pre-lacy was practically in Knox's hands"; and he recommends "those who hold that Knox was an enemy to an epis-

copal hierarchy to study the articles" referred to above.

² Letter to lord Broughley.—Tytler, vi. 179.

of his personal friends were among the victims. A convention of Protestants was summoned in the regent's name to meet in Edinburgh on the 20th October, and it was then proposed to hold a week's fast and to form a league with England and the Reformers on the Continent for mutual defence against the plots of the papists.¹

Another plot, the second of its kind, was being busily hatched at this time against the life of the unfortunate queen Mary. It was represented to the regent Mar, and to lord Morton who swayed his counsels, that unless the English realm were delivered of Mary, the life of Elizabeth would be no longer safe.² The plan proposed was to hand Mary over to the regent and his party, "to proceed with her by way of justice;" and the business was to be despatched, as lord Burghley wrote, "speedily and secretly." Both Mar and Morton agreed to the proposal. Mary was to be secretly executed "within four hours"; "and the only cause of delay," as Tytler remarks, "on the part of the regent and his brother earl, was the selfish wish of making the most profit of this cruel bargain." It was a cold-blooded scheme which reflects even more shame on the two Scotsmen chiefly implicated—there were others in the plot, including "two ministers"—than on Elizabeth and her advisers. Within ten days after the interview with the English ambassador on this business the regent Mar died suddenly at Stirling on the 28th October 1572. So the plot miscarried and Mary, unconsciously to herself, was respited for many weary years and the sad ending at Fotheringay.³ Morton at this time added to the dishonour of his name by selling into the

¹ Confederation of Protestants, see Teulet, *Papiers*, etc. iii. 145 *seq.*; Bannatyne, pp. 397-411; M'Crie's *Life of Knox*, ii. 215-217; Tytler,

vi. 171-188; Burton, iv. 344.

² "Vita Mariæ, mors Elizabeth; vita Elizabeth, mors Mariæ."

³ See Tytler, vi. 174-189.

hands of Elizabeth his prisoner, the earl of Northumberland, who had befriended him when he was an exile in England. The earl was shortly afterwards executed at York.¹

After the installation of his successor the health of Knox rapidly declined. It is given as an instance of his gay good-humour that, on the following Saturday, which was the last day he was able to sit at table, he caused a hogshead of wine to be pierced for a visitor, and told him to send for it as long as it lasted, as he could not tarry for it. He had many visitors of all ranks in his closing days, some of whom read and talked with him on topics of Christian consolation. Lawson read the prayer for the sick appointed in the Liturgy that went by Knox's name. On Sunday the 23rd, which was the first day of the fast for the Huguenot massacre, Knox told his friends that he had been meditating for two nights on the troubled state of the Church, the spouse of Jesus Christ, and pleading with God on her behalf. He then repeated the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer, making devotional reflections on the several petitions, and saying as he uttered "Our Father which art in heaven," "Who can pronounce so holy words?" Next evening, when the family prayers were said, he was asked if he had heard them, to which he answered, "I would to God that you and all men heard them as I have heard them, and I praise God for that heavenly sound." About eleven o'clock, Bannatyne, his attendant, on observing him heave a deep sigh, asked him to give a sign that he heard; upon which he lifted up his hand, and in the same moment breathed his last.²

Knox died on the 24th November 1572, in his sixty-seventh year, thirteen years after his last return to

¹ Tytler calls Morton "this base and avaricious man," and he seems to have merited the description.—*Hist.* vi. 189.

² Bannatyne acted in the double capacity of servant and secretary to Knox, and wrote the *Journal of Transactions in Scotland*.

Scotland. He was buried on the 26th in the churchyard of St. Giles', where Morton is said to have pronounced the eulogy that "he neither feared nor flattered any flesh."¹

So much polemical discussion has arisen between extreme partisans and equally extreme opponents over John Knox, that much of the real man has been hidden by the dust of controversy. From his own *History of the Reformation*, a valuable contribution to the knowledge of the times, bearing in a remarkable degree the stamp of the writer's individuality, and from other contemporary documents, we have the materials for forming some fair idea of the Reformer's character. First, his powers of declamation were exceptional, and unrivalled by any preacher of his day. There are several testimonies to the rousing effect which his sermons, often political addresses in the guise of religious discourses, had on the masses of the people; and not on the masses only, but also on men like the English ambassador, who declared that a sermon from Knox put them all on their mettle, and was worth a battalion of soldiers. His rare skill also in dialectics and in controversy has to be acknowledged. Discounting somewhat from the controversial victories reported by himself, it is true, nevertheless, that he was a match for the ablest of his antagonists, and could always give a reason for the faith that was in him, and a still better reason perhaps against the faith of his opponents. His personal influence with his contemporaries, with lordly barons and simple burghers, was also remarkable, and not less so the courage with which he almost invariably dared the opposition of the strongest. His influence upon the Reformation in Scotland has been,

¹ James Melville in his *Diary*, p. 60, is the only contemporary authority for Morton's speech, which has been

frequently varied and enlarged by later historians.

no doubt, much over-rated, for the Reformation was virtually accomplished before Knox returned from Geneva; but all his influence afterwards, greater than that of any other single man in Scotland, was thrown into the scale, and largely contributed to the success of Protestantism. Again, it redounds to his credit that in a venal age, and associated as he was with many whose avarice and greed of Church property whetted their reforming zeal, Knox was throughout absolutely disinterested.¹

This is much to be said of any public man of Knox's school and in Knox's day. But the same sources of information prove, beyond contradiction, that he was in principle as intolerant as the papists, and in his own belief as infallible as any pope; and that but for the restraining hand of the barons he would have been as relentless a persecutor as any Romanist in the land. "Death to the idolaters" was a common cry of himself and his party, not spoken hastily in the heat of debate, but uttered in cold blood. His religion was grounded, not so much on the "Evangel," which was often on the reformers' lips, as on the Judaism of the Old Testament. Knox was thoroughly at home in that literature, and drew from it his choicest weapons against what he called Roman idolatry. Again, it was a feature of Knox's character that he seldom could be generous to an opponent, and never could brook opposition. His warmest friends, when they differed from him and opposed him in religion or politics, as, for instance, Maitland and Kirkaldy, were held up by him to public odium. His conduct to queen Mary has been already commented on, and it was less excusable than his ordinary treatment of opponents because she was his sovereign,—a young and inexperienced woman, too—bearing a great responsibility and exposed

¹ See *Knox's Works*, Laing's ed. vi. 617.

to special temptations, which might well have won her the sympathy of her Scottish subjects, even though they were protestant ministers. Knox's religion, it has been said, was a misapplied form of Judaism; and making every allowance for the provocation to retaliate on men who showed little or no mercy to Protestants, still, when all has been said that can be said, the evidence shows that Knox in his public career was more imbued with the spirit of the Old Testament than of the New.¹

Edinburgh castle fell after a protracted siege on the 29th May 1573. Morton, who succeeded Mar in the regency, had secured the aid of a regiment of English artillery, and with their siege guns a breach was soon made in the walls. This, and the threatened mutiny of the soldiers, compelled the surrender of the castle. Maitland of Lethington had taken refuge in it, paralysed in body, but still keen and active in intellect. He anticipated the fate in store for him by being, it is said, his own executioner; or, as Sir James Melvil puts it, "he took a drink and died as the old Romans were wont to do."² Knox had called him an atheist, and Maitland rebutted the charge with indignation, adding a confession of his faith which might have satisfied the rigour of a Calvinist. "I have been brought up from my youth and instructed in the fear of God, and to know that He has appointed heaven for the habitation of His elect, and also hell for the everlasting dwelling-place of the reprobate."³ Kirkaldy,

¹ Dr. Cunningham remarks that "their religion in some of its aspects was more Jewish than Christian" (*Hist. Ch. Scot.* i. 490). In confirmation of this estimate of Knox's character and influence compare the estimate of four of our leading Protestant historians, laymen of different schools of politics, and all of them advocates of the freedom of religious

opinion. Hume, *Hist. Eng.* v. 27. 52; Tytler, *Hist. Scot.* vi. 194; Burton, *Hist. Scot.* v. 85; Buckle, *Hist. Civ.* iii. 75. Skelton in his *Mary Stuart*, p. 52, describes Knox as being "as ruthless as a prophet of Israel, as narrow as a Spanish inquisitor."

² *Memoirs*, p. 256.

³ Bannatyne's *Memorials*, p. 415.

the Governor, met his fate fearlessly like the brave soldier that he was. Sir James Melvil, who knew him well, describes him as "humble, gentle, and meek—like a lamb in the house, but like a lion in the field." Elizabeth begged that his life should be spared, and many in Scotland wished it might be so;¹ but Morton was inexorable now that he had the strong man in his power. And so the great captain suffered the ignominy of being hanged at the market cross of Edinburgh on the 3rd August.²

In the short space of thirteen years—1560-1573—many of the prominent actors in the Reformation struggle had passed, one after another, from the scene. The affairs of Church and State now fell into other hands, and ecclesiastical politics assumed various shapes before the year 1592, when Presbytery triumphed—for a time.

¹ Teulet, *Relations Politiques*, ii. 449. Maitland and Kirkaldy see Skelton's *Maitland of Lethington*.

² For a full account of both

CHAPTER VI

JAMES VI.—GOVERNMENTS OF REGENT MORTON AND OF KING JAMES, 1573-1582

Morton's rule—Persecution of Romanists—Titular bishops under the Assembly—Return of Andrew Melville—Knox and Melville compared—Morton's ecclesiastical policy—His device for paying stipends—Assembly deals with Church festivals—Melville's first attack on titular Episcopate—Assembly limits bishops to particular charges—Patrick Adamson titular archbishop—Assembly deals with Adamson and with heretics, and ministers keeping ale-houses—Lord Glamis's six questions to Beza—Beza's answers—Morals of the people in 1578—Letters from the pope to king James and to the Scots—Melville as Moderator—His influence over the Kirk—"Sang scuils"—Bassandyne Bible—Two new Court favourites, Lennox and Arran—Execution of Morton—Fresh arrival of Jesuits—Melville renews attack on titular bishops—Assembly of Dundee 1580 condemns Episcopacy—Jesuit scare and the signing of the king's Confession—Formation of the first presbyteries—Review of ecclesiastical position—Second Book of Discipline—Montgomery, tulchan archbishop of Glasgow—Difference between titular and tulchan bishops—Death of George Buchanan.

THE early associates of Morton had all passed away before he attained the regency. In political capacity he was equal to the office, and deserved the compliment "a shrewd fellow" paid him by Killigrew, the English ambassador. Rulers in that age were very seldom models in morals, but Morton was immoral beyond all his compeers.¹ In insatiable avarice he outstripped all the reforming lords, deeply implicated as they were in

¹ Skelton's *Queen Mary*, p. 49.

sacrilege. He was, nevertheless, a capable regent, and by his vigilant punishment of crime he soon restored to the realm a degree of order and prosperity which surprised the English ambassador who had known Scotland in previous regencies.¹

Morton was at first forbearing in his treatment of Roman Catholics, but the General Assemblies goaded him into persecution. The Assembly of 1572 enacted that all papists should be compelled to declare their creed; and next year it charged the superintendents "to proceed summarily to excommunicate all papists," unless within eight days they "joined themselves to the religion presently established in the realm."² The Privy Council in February 1574 took similar action, and forbade, under pain of death, any dealings with certain Roman ecclesiastics whose names they entered in a schedule. Some priests were banished, one or two imprisoned, and one, named Thomas Robinson, formerly master of the school at Paisley, suffered death for saying mass.³

The titular bishops were also taken in hand by the Assembly. The Concordat of Leith made them subject to its jurisdiction; and year by year their episcopal conduct was reviewed, often censured, and sometimes corrected by "godly discipline." In the spring Assembly of 1573 the aged titular (Douglas) of St. Andrews was charged with neglect of visitation, and pleaded bad health; in the autumn Assembly the eccentric bishop (Gordon) of Galloway was accused of ministerial intrusion into Edinburgh, and of acknowledging the queen's authority—a

¹ Teulet, *Relations Politiques*, iii. 6, 13.

² *Acts of Gen. Assemblies*, part i. pp. 253, 262.

³ In the *Diurnal of Occurrents*, p. 341, there is an entry of a priest, not

named, being hung in Glasgow, 4th May 1574; but this is supposed to be the same person as the Robinson mentioned by Buchanan in the previous year.

—he was careful, though invited, never himself to attend—in which he promised to redress the standing grievance of the ministers' poverty, and to fill up the vacant bishoprics, among others Glasgow, Dunblane, and Ross, still nominally held by the Roman prelates, Beaton, Chisholm, and Leslie. He proposed also a suffragan for St. Andrews, with charge of the Lothians, therein anticipating the legislation of Charles I. Meanwhile the superintendents were to take the oversight of the vacant sees.

Titular bishops were appointed, but the ministers' stipends were as badly paid as before. Many of the lords and lairds who had secured the Church lands were loath to part with the share of the thirds allocated as stipends, and it was always easy to put off the mendicant minister "wondering for his bread." Complaints increased, and the regent began to be highly unpopular with the protestant party. To recover his waning influence he made a bold move, and only his besetting avarice prevented its success; he undertook, in the name of the Crown, to collect the thirds from the landholders, and become the ministers' immediate paymaster. It was a plausible scheme, and if honestly carried out, might have paved the way to a permanent settlement. The regent's method, however, was not honest, and only aggravated the evil. He began by joining several parishes together, nominating readers as assistants, so as to save the difference between the stipends of minister and reader. He also cut down the allowance for superintendents,¹ and all the savings found their way into his own coffers. What he did with the money no one could tell; it could only be surmised that it was hoarded in his castle at Dalkeith.²

¹ Spottiswoode, *Hist.* ii. 195, 196.

² His hoard was estimated at this time at five or six hundred thousand crowns, and it was rumoured that he

wished to deport it for safety to Germany.—Teulet, *Relations Politiques*, iii. 66.

Yet he was always impecunious, often importuning queen Elizabeth for money to carry on his Government, fining merchants and tradesmen on various pretexts, and even mulcting Protestants for transgressing the statute by eating flesh during Lent.¹ The stipends were no better paid, and the ministers were kept dangling at the court for redress. They resented this treatment, and the regent answered them in his own supercilious way, saying that "there would be no peace in the land until some of the ministers were hanged." Melville utilised the ministers' grievance to gain their support in the battle he was about to fight for ends less mercenary than stipends. When Morton threatened Melville, Greek met Greek, and he answered the regent defiantly—"Tush! threaten your courtiers in that way; it is all the same to me whether I rot in the air or in the ground. It is out of your power to hang or exile the truth."²

The Assembly which met in Edinburgh, 7th March 1575, is notable for two of its Acts—the election of Boyd, the titular bishop of Glasgow, to the moderator's chair, and the attack upon the mediæval mystery plays. The autumn Assembly, in the same place, assailed another survival of the past—the observance of festivals and saints' days.³ The boys of the Aberdeen Grammar School, "disordered bairns," would keep their Christmas holidays "at the superstitious time of Yule"; and in this they were only taking a leaf out of the book of ministers and readers who kept the Christian festivals both in town and country.⁴ Some dwellers in Dumfries, a little later, were also festally disposed, and what they could not have

¹ Tytler, vi. 219.

² Melville's *Diary*, pp. 52, 53. The writer of this *Diary* was the nephew of Andrew Melville.

³ Calderwood, *Hist.* iii. 350.

⁴ The regent Morton held a Privy

Council at Aberdeen in August 1574, to which he summoned the provost and bailies, and laid upon them strict injunctions to see that the festivals were abolished, "which were usit before in tyme of ignorance and Pap-

in their own town they secured by a procession to Lincluden collegiate church, where they celebrated Christmas in the time-honoured way.¹

The Assembly in 1575 was also marked by the first of Melville's attacks upon the principle of Episcopacy. Durie, a minister in Edinburgh, Melville's leading supporter, raised the question whether the name and office of bishop, as then existing in Scotland, had any warrant in the Word of God; and whether chapters with their powers of election ought any longer to be tolerated. The matter was shelved for a time by appointing a committee of six ministers to debate it, three on each side, after the manner of the old academic wranglings. Against Episcopacy were John Craig, formerly Knox's colleague, now minister in Aberdeen, James Lawson his successor in Edinburgh, and principal Melville; on the other side George Hay, commissioner of Caithness, John Row, minister in Perth, and David Lindsay, minister in Leith. Their report, brief and slightly evasive, was to this effect—"They think it not expedient presently to answer directly to the first question; but if any bishop shall be found who hath not such qualities as the Word of God requireth, that he be tried by the General Assembly *de novo*, and so deposed." In a note they are more explicit, and give their account of the office of a bishop. "First, the name of bishop is common to all those who have a particular flock, over which they have a particular charge, as well to preach the word, as to administer the sacraments, and execute ecclesiastical discipline, with consent of their elders. And this is their chief function by the Word of God. Also, out of this number may be chosen

istrie," and that all monuments of idolatry, specially naming organs, be removed out of the kirk.—*Reg. Priv.* Co. ii. 390.

¹ Spottiswoode, *Hist.* ii. 337; M'Dowall, *Hist. Dumfries*, pp. 258, 259.

some to have power to oversee and visit such reasonable bounds beside their own flock as the general kirk shall appoint; and in these bounds to appoint ministers, with consent of the ministers of that province, and with consent of the flock to whom they shall be appointed; also, to appoint elders and deacons in every particular congregation where there is none, with consent of the people thereof; and to suspend ministers for reasonable causes with consent of the ministers of the bounds."¹

This was the first victory gained by Melville, who was already recognised as the champion of Presbytery. In successive years he pushed his advantage step by step until he carried the Assembly with him to the conclusion that the office of diocesan bishop was unlawful, and without warrant from the Word of God.

Year by year the battle was renewed in the Assembly, and Acts were passed curtailing the prerogatives of the titular bishops, and censuring them on various grounds. The Assembly of 1576 limited each bishop to a particular charge, and set apart Dunblane cathedral for the bishop of that see, and Fortrose cathedral for the bishop of Ross.² Several of the bishops, and among them Boyd of Glasgow, declined to be limited in their choice of a flock, Boyd stating he was in the habit of preaching in Givvin (Govan). In the next Assembly, when cited on the same business, he referred the members to the Concordat of Leith, and reminded them that it was to continue in force during the minority of the king, or until abrogated by Parliament; and that if he opposed this arrangement, in submission to which he had accepted his bishopric, he would be guilty of perjury. He consented, however, as a compromise, to

¹ Calderwood, *Hist.* iii. 355, 356; Spottiswoode, ii. 200, 201; *Book of the Universal Kirk*, pp. 148-153.

² Calderwood, iii. 358-368; Spottiswoode, ii. 201, 202; *Book of Universal Kirk*, pp. 153-155.

preach in a particular church in the sheriffdom of Ayr while residing in that district, and to observe a similar rule in Glasgow, but "without prejudicing the power and jurisdiction he received with the said bishopric." With this the Assembly had, meanwhile, to be content, for, as Calderwood remarks, "the Assembly could not use their full authority, because the regent bearing rule for the time was earnestly set for the estate of bishops." The members of Assembly knew well that to fight with the titular bishop was to challenge Morton himself, who had made them feel that he was no titular regent.¹

The Assembly had a second bout with another titular prelate, Patrick Adamson, elected by the regent to succeed Douglas in the see of St. Andrews. The real name of the archbishop-elect was Patrick Constance or Constantine, and so he is described in several Assembly and other records prior to this period.² Adamson's earlier history had been similar to that of his great rival, Melville, whom he preceded as a student at St. Andrews, Paris, Poitiers, and Geneva, enjoying at the last place the instruction and friendship of Beza. His reputation as a scholar stood second only to Melville's, while his character also entitled him to the promotion conferred by the regent. But the Assembly told him that he ought, according to their ordinance, to have been tried and examined by them prior to being admitted by the chapter, upon which Adamson made answer that the said ordinance had never received legal confirmation, and that he could not therefore submit to it, which ended the business for that time.³

¹ Calderwood, iii. 370, 371; Spottiswoode, ii. 202; *Book of Universal Kirk*, pp. 155-162.

² In a MS. note in a copy of Keith's *Catalogue*, possessed by the late Principal Lee of Edinburgh, Adamson is said to have been the son of Adam Con-

stance, a Perth hatter. The "Adamson" would therefore probably be the father's Christian name with the suffix.

³ Previous reference has been made to the sermon which Adamson preached at St. Andrews on the election of his predecessor Douglas to the see.

What would now be called a heresy case occupied this Assembly. Thomas Hepburn, a minister, was accused of teaching that no soul enters heaven, where Christ is glorified, until after the last judgment. Some members conferred with Hepburn privately, but he was not convinced by their arguments, and so the Assembly unanimously "damned and detested the said article, and judged the same to be heretical, false, and erroneous," and forbade Hepburn the exercise of the ministry.¹

Among other questions raised at the same Assembly was that of the "Sabbath"; and "salt-pans, mills, and other labours which draw away innumerable people from hearing of the word" were unsparingly condemned. Still more singular, as showing the revolution in public opinion, is the following entry in the Assembly's records touching a post-Reformation practice—"A minister, or reader, tapping aile, beare, or wine, or keeping open taverne, is to be exhorted by the commissioners to keep decorum."² Roman ecclesiastics were forbidden by the provincial canons to enter taverns unless on a journey; but bad as clerical morals were then, no canon was ever deemed necessary to forbid priests from keeping taverns, or to enjoin them if they did so, to keep them with decorum. Whether the chronic poverty of the ministers, due to the insatiable greed of the reforming lords, was responsible for this practice, or whether it was attributable to unconventional ideas of the new ministers' social status, must be left to conjecture. The idea suggested of clerical occupation in the latter part of the sixteenth century if not pleasant is certainly picturesque.

Mackenzie's *Lives*, iii. 364-366; M'Crie's *Life of Melville*, i. 122, 445-448; *Diary of James Melville*, pp. 31, 32; Bannatyne's *Transactions*, p. 323, where Adamson is called "Mr. Patrick Consting."

¹ Calderwood, iii. 373; Spottiswoode, ii. 202; *Book of the Universal Kirk*, pp. 155-162.

² Calderwood, iii. 377; *Book of the Universal Kirk*, p. 160.

The Assembly which met in October 1577 (they had departed from the earlier custom of meeting at Christmas) asked the regent to attend in person or by a commissioner ; but he excused himself, and sent for their consideration a series of questions on ecclesiastical government, intended, as has been supposed, to embarrass the Assembly while engaged in drafting its new scheme of Church polity, the Second Book of Discipline.

During the discussions on ecclesiastical polity the protestant chancellor, lord Glamis, famed for his great learning,¹ consulted Beza, who had now become the theological oracle of the reformed churches, on certain matters in dispute. He put six questions to Beza which have still an interest for ecclesiastics. Was the office of bishops necessary in the Church for the calling of ministers, or for their deposition? Or rather, should not all ministers be equal in grade, and appoint and remove men to or from the ministry with consent of the patron and people? Should the General Assemblies meet with or without the consent of the king? By whom should ecclesiastical Assemblies be convoked—by the king or by the bishops? On what subjects were they entitled to legislate? Should papists be visited with excommunication, or with a lighter punishment, and for what causes might excommunication be resorted to? Lastly, what were the lawful uses of Church property that had been previously dedicated to God?

Beza answered the questions, and wrote a treatise, in support of his answers, on the Triple Episcopate,² which he described as the Divine, the human, and the satanic—the Divine recognised in the Scriptures; the human represented by the early Fathers; and the satanic as it

¹ Tytler, v. 242.

² *De Triplici Episcopatu* was its

title, and it was afterwards translated into English.

blossomed under the papacy.¹ The reply, as might have been expected from a thorough Republican, was an attack upon the threefold ministry, and a defence of ministerial parity, which proved a welcome support to Melville and his allies. Melville had frequent correspondence with Beza, as Knox had had with Calvin; and in one of his letters written to Beza in November 1579 reference is made to this subject. "We have now," Melville writes, "for five years maintained a warfare against pseudo-episcopacy, and have not ceased to urge the adoption of a strict discipline. We have presented to his Majesty and the Three Estates of the kingdom at different times, and recently at the Parliament which is now sitting, a form of discipline to be enacted and confirmed by public authority. The king is favourably inclined to us; almost all the nobility are adverse. They complain that if pseudo-episcopacy be abolished, the state of the kingdom will be overturned; if presbyteries be established, the royal authority will be diminished; if the ecclesiastical goods are restored to their legitimate use, the royal treasury will be exhausted. They plead that bishops, with abbots and priors, form the third estate in Parliament; that all jurisdiction, ecclesiastical as well as civil, pertains solely to the king and his council, and that all the ecclesiastical property should go into the exchequer. In many this way of speaking and thinking may be imputed to ignorance; in more to a flagitious life and bad morals; in almost all to a desire of seizing such of the Church property as yet remains, and the dread of losing what they have already got into their possession."²

While learned men were exchanging learned letters

¹ See Keble's *Life of Hooker*, prefixed to works, i. 74-76. woode, ii. 221; Melville's *Diary*, p. 55; M'Crie's *Life of Melville*, i.

² Calderwood, iii. 397; Spottis- 199-202.

with brethren on the Continent, and wrangling with each other at home, the moral condition of the country was not of a satisfactory or creditable character, as the Assembly of 1578 bears witness. It laments "the universall corruptions of the hail estates of the bodie of this realme, the great coldness and slackness of religione in the greatest pairt of the professors of the same, with the daily increase of all kinde of fearful sinnes and enormities."¹ Yet there was little that the Assembly did not attempt to regulate, or to suppress if it displeased them. Sermon hearing, school holidays, music, dancing, the apparel of ministers, and the raiment of ministers' wives, were all alike severely supervised.² And still, after twenty years' protestant rule, the morals of the Scottish people did not improve under their new masters. The sackcloth, almost the only vestment of the Roman sacristy saved from the reforming fires, was in frequent requisition for violations of the seventh commandment; and, as we have seen, the sixth and the eighth were more honoured in the breach than in the observance.

On the 12th March 1578 Morton was compelled to resign the regency. It is hard to say by which class in the community he was most disliked, for he had in turn offended all. He was ousted by a cabal headed by the earls of Argyll and Atholl; and the king, now twelve years old, nominally assumed the government, aided by a council of twelve, amongst whom the two earls were prominent.³ In less than a year, however, Morton regained his old ascendancy, and was again regent in fact, if not in name.

The Romanists were now unusually active both in England and Scotland. Among other objects they aimed

¹ *Book of Universal Kirk*, p. 176.

² *Ibid.* p. 335; Burton, *Hist.* v. 145.

³ Teulet, *Papiers*, etc. iii. 171, 183.

at securing the person of the young king, in order to have him educated abroad in a Roman Catholic court, and brought up in their faith. Bishop Leslie (of Ross) was indefatigable in visits, archbishop Beaton was untiring in correspondence, and even his holiness the pope (Gregory XIII.) had so far committed himself as to make an offer of money in advance to forward the scheme.¹ The pope had, in the previous year, congratulated James on his assuming the government, and expressed the hope that he would defend and maintain the Catholic religion, "which offered the best guarantee for the safety and endurance of kingdoms." Bishop Leslie was the bearer of another letter from the pope of the same date, and addressed "To all Scotsmen," exhorting them to return forthwith to the only true faith.² The boy-king, if he could be captured, was to be transported from Dunbar, or from Dunbarton, to the Court of France. Had the plot succeeded, how much might it have changed the religion and politics, not only of Scotland, but also of England, and even remoter lands.

We may here pause to look at the youthful king who was the object of so much solicitude to pope and to monarchs. Killigrew, the English ambassador, gives an interesting account of the precocious lad as he saw him at Stirling on the completion of his eighth year. He writes: "His grace is well grown, both in body and spirit, since I was last here. He speaketh the French tongue marvellous well; and that which seems strange to me, he was able *extempore* (which he did before me) to read a chapter of the Bible out of Latin into French, and out of

¹ See Tytler, vi. 254, 255, and notes for authorities as to correspondence, and Bellesheim, iii. 245; Teulet, *Papiers*, etc. iii. 227. For an earlier

attempt (1574) to have James transferred to Flanders, see Teulet, *Papiers*, etc. iii. 155.

² Bellesheim, iii. 246.

French after into English ; so well as few men could have added anything to his translation. His schoolmasters, Mr. George Buchanan and Mr. Peter Young, rare men, caused me to appoint the king what chapter I would ; and so did I, whereby I perceived it was not studied for. They also made his highness dance before me, which he likewise did with a very good grace ; a prince sure of great hope, if God send him life."¹ Four years had passed since then, and the rigour of Buchanan, with the gentler discipline of Young, had made the boy-king a very good scholar for his years. It was all that they could make him, a learned prince ; no schooling in the world would have made him a wise one.

The spring Assembly of 1578 was memorable for the moderatorship of Melville. Whether in or out of the moderator's chair he was the dominating spirit in the Kirk for more than twenty years.² And this can be said of him, which cannot be said of every man who has risen to a position of virtual dictatorship in Church or State, that he had honourably won the foremost place by learning, by ability, by character, and by indefatigable zeal for what he believed to be the true interests of Christ and the Church. Men speak of ministerial parity, of which in theory Melville was the advocate, as if any such thing could possibly exist in Church or in State. Melville himself exercised for many years in Scotland a wider and more substantial authority than was exercised in England by the archbishops of Canterbury and York. They ruled in virtue of their office within the limits of law and canon.

¹ MS. letter cited by Tytler, vi. 221, 222 ; Teulet, *Papiers*, etc. iii. 157.

² Burton, *Hist.* v. 146, has a suggestive note on the use of the words "church" and "kirk." He says, "We have seen that the word

'church' is employed in the title of the Book of Common Order, but in the legislative and official documents it is ever 'the kirk.' This is closer to the original *kurios oikos* than the English term, or even the German *kirche*."

Melville ruled by sheer force of character, practically unchecked save by his native shrewdness and Scottish caution.

The process of shearing the titular shepherds of their episcopal authority was continued in the next Assembly. We have seen that they were denuded of their diocesan duties, and limited to the care of particular flocks. Boyd of Glasgow now repeated his protest in writing, in which he affirmed, "I understand the name, office, and modest reverence borne to a bishop, to be lawful and allowable by the Scriptures of God; and being elected by the Church and king to be bishop of Glasgow, I esteem my calling and office lawful." Melville and the Assembly were, however, too strong for him, and next year he made an unconditional submission.¹ The previous Assembly of 1578 had ordered that all bishops and other ecclesiastics with official titles should hereafter be called by their own names; and that chapters should cease, until further orders, to elect diocesan bishops. Further orders were now given, and the prohibitions, so far as the Assembly could enforce them, were made perpetual. The titulars, as we shall see, survived the ordeal.²

It is pleasant to turn aside from the wranglings of bishops and Assemblies to record the rehabilitation of the old "sang scuils." These ancient schools, combining as they did music with the arts and grammar, were a recognised feature in the mediæval scholastic system, and paved the way in many towns for the burgh and grammar schools that were founded before the Reformation. A statute of 1579 decrees their restoration "for instruction of youth in the art of music and singing which is almost

¹ Calderwood, iii. 426-433, 445; *Book of the Universal Kirk*, pp. 181-185.

² Calderwood, iii. 398-405, 410-413; *Book of Univ. Kirk*, pp. 172-181.

decayed, and shall shortly decay without timeous remedy be provided." The statute is evidence of the decay of the sacred art amidst the din of ecclesiastical controversy.

In the same year, 1579, the first Bible that was printed in Scotland came from the press of Arbuthnot and Bassandyne, Edinburgh. It is generally known as the Bassandyne Bible, and was printed from the second Genevan edition of 1561. It was partially used in Scotland, cumbered as it was with Calvinistic notes, until superseded by the English translation of 1611. An earlier translation of the Bible made by the Anglican Church was, as we have seen, approved by the Scottish Parliament a few years before the Reformation, and passed into circulation despite the opposition of the Roman prelates in Council.

The political entanglements of the period oblige us to pass for a brief space from the Church to the Court, from Melville to king James. In September 1579, Esmé Stuart, commonly known as lord D'Aubigny, nephew of the late earl of Lennox, came over from France and speedily became a favourite with the king.¹ It was the weakness of James's character that he was always the tool of men who humoured and flattered him. Esmé was a polished Frenchified Scot, and soon gained complete ascendancy over his cousin, who created him earl, and subsequently duke, of Lennox. To support his rank the king made him chamberlain of Scotland, and added the abbacy of Arbroath.² A little later, there was another favourite, James Stewart, captain of the Royal Guard, second son of lord Ochiltree, and therefore John Knox's brother-in-law. He became in a short time earl of Arran ;

¹ Teulet, *Papiers*, etc. iii. 231.

is estimated at ten thousand crowns.—

² The annual rental of the abbey

Teulet, *Relations Politiques*, iii. 77.

and the two counsellors, Lennox and Arran, led the king and the country a merry dance for some years.

Lennox was a Romanist, and secretly in league with the princes of Guise and the papacy; but he disguised his principles, averred that he had been converted by the king, and made a formal profession of Protestantism in 1580. Arran was an accomplished and unprincipled adventurer, without religious profession, though by heredity he ought to have been a Protestant. Under their influence the king broke off communication with Elizabeth, opened correspondence with his mother, and soon a little army of plotters and counterplotters was in the field. Morton was caught in their toils, and was accused, before the king in the council-chamber at Stirling, of being privy to the murder of Darnley his father. He denied the charge both then and afterwards, while admitting that he had been consulted about the murder without consenting to it. On this confession he was condemned, and beheaded at Edinburgh by the guillotine called "the Maiden," 2nd June 1581. There was no one to say a word of eulogy over his grave as he had done over Knox's. While the head was exposed as a traitor's on the Tolbooth, the headless body was buried in silence by some poor men on the evening of the execution. So fell the great earl of Morton. One may regret his fate, but there is deeper cause for regret that abilities such as his were not devoted with more disinterestedness to the service of his country. The four successive regents in the king's minority—Moray, Lennox, Mar, and Morton—were as unfortunate in their deaths as the five Jameses had been. Three of them died by treachery or violence, and Mar's death was not free from suspicion.

The Jesuits, who had been in Scotland as early as 1542, were now again active in the country, and sanguine

of its recovery to their faith. Many of the exiled Scottish priests had joined the Society of the Jesuits, and returned with renewed ardour to reconvert their countrymen. Father Hay had landed in Dundee in the winter of 1579, and great was the commotion in that protestant town over the appearance of the Jesuit. The ministers thundered from the pulpit, and declared that "the Jesuits were a new race of persons, far worse than papists"; and the Assembly took up the note and branded them as "the pestilent dregs of a most detestable idolatry." Three hundred Roman Catholics appeared in the church at Turriff, and prayed to God and the saints on bended knees for the conversion of the country; and another hundred publicly received their communion in Edinburgh at the Christmas of 1581.¹ A year before, Balcanqual, minister in Edinburgh, had roused the people in a sermon on the changed attitude of the papacy. Papists now, he said, openly avowed themselves in the streets of Edinburgh, where they discussed religion as freely as they did in the streets of Paris. In the king's palace, in kirk-sessions, and even in the general assemblies they also avowed their papistry and impugned the truth.² Lennox was the prime mover of this last effort of the Jesuits—the expiring flicker of a lost cause. Now that Morton was removed there was no one strong enough to resist his influence. He was mistrusted by the ministers; trusted, indeed, by few save the king; but the more he was mistrusted the deeper became his duplicity as a professed Protestant. Balcanqual afterwards directly attacked the duke from the pulpit in language which shows the peculiar taste of the age. He said "that within these four years popery had entered in the country,

¹ Forbes-Leith's *Narrative of Scot. Cath.* pp. 145, 177, 184.

² Calderwood, iii. 773 - 775; Spottiswoode, ii. 267.

not only in the court, but in the king's hall, and was maintained by the tyranny of a great champion which is called Grace, and if his Grace would oppose himself to God's Word, he should have little grace." On being summoned to defend his language he pleaded, as Knox used to plead, the privilege of the pulpit.¹

During these proceedings Melville was busy preparing his final attack upon "pseudo-episcopacy," as he correctly called it. The Assembly met in Dundee, 12th July 1580, under the moderatorship of James Lawson, and everything was ready for the assault. At the fourth session an Act was passed by which Episcopacy as then established was formally condemned. It deposed the bishops not only from their episcopal office, but from all exercise of the ministry "until they receive *de novo* admission from the General Assembly of the Church, under the pain of excommunication to be used against them."² The Reformation settlement of 1560 had been made by Act of Parliament, though the queen never confirmed it; and the Concordat of Leith, which established titular Episcopacy, had the sanction of both Church and State; but here the Assembly arrogated to itself civil as well as ecclesiastical functions, and, regardless of Sovereign and Parliament, condemned the established religion of the time, and dared its chief ministers under the penalty of its excommunication to exercise the humblest office of their ministry. Under such an usurpation constitutional government was impossible; and it only affords one more proof that protestant supremacy could be in its own way as arrogant and intolerant as the papacy.

¹ Teulet, *Relations Politiques*, iii. 125, 126; Calderwood, iii. 583, 584. Balcanqual's language in the pulpit was beyond all justification; e.g. he called Lennox "a profane French ruffian who in any other reformed

country would be hanged before the sun."—Calderwood, iii. 775.

² Calderwood, iii. 463 - 473; Spottiswoode, ii. 272; *Book of the Univ. Kirk*, pp. 193-201.

257 ministers assisted by 151 exhorters, and 455 readers; and in 1574 the numbers had increased to 289 ministers and 715 readers. The peculiar order of exhorters was dropped in the interval, probably being merged in minister or reader; and now, in 1581, the latter was doomed to pass away. It is difficult to see the wisdom of the Assembly in abolishing the reader at this stage, as more than the half, if not two-thirds, of the parishes were still unprovided with ministers.¹

To return to the Assembly of 1581. It confirmed the abolition of the episcopal order decreed the previous year, and approved of the King's Confession. It also launched upon the Church a new code of ecclesiastical polity which received the name of the Second Book of Discipline. Since 1578 this code had been in hand, and Morton had tried in vain to suppress or modify it. Several conferences were held between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities on the subject; and in one held at Stirling between a committee of Parliament and certain commissioners of the Church the document was examined article by article; some were accepted, some rejected, and others deferred for further consideration.² The Assembly which at Dundee had boldly legislated on things ecclesiastical in despite of the Crown, was none the less solicitous to secure its sanction for the new code; but beyond the revision at Stirling the civil authority would not go. And so the Assembly resolved that "the Book of Policy, agreed upon in divers Assemblies before, should be registered in the Acts of the Kirk and remain therein, *ad perpetuam rei memoriam*, and that a copy thereof should be taken by

and the Isles from which the returns had not been received. — *Book of Univ. Kirk*, p. 212.

¹ *Miscellany* of the Wodrow Society, i. 321-396.

² Spottiswoode gives, *Hist.* ii. 233-256, from the original copy in his possession, used at Stirling, the articles seriatim with notes of agreement and disagreement.

every presbytery.”¹ The remarkable thing is that the presbyteries here referred to, and so recently organised, are not once named in this Second Book of Discipline. It recognises four ecclesiastical convocations, (1) the Œcumenical, for all nations—practically a dead letter, (2) the National, represented by the General Assembly, (3) the Provincial, namely the Synod, and (4) the Congregational or Kirk-Session. The omission of the presbytery shows that the idea of that court was not present to the minds of the compilers while drafting their polity ; and, so far as appears, the court which is now more especially distinctive of presbyterial government owes its existence to the suggestion of James VI. as a device for the better payment of ministers.

The Second Book of Discipline contains thirteen chapters ; and is less than half the size of the First Book. It must suffice here, after the details given of the earlier code, to mention the chief points of difference between the two. The laying on of hands in ordination, which had been dispensed with in the First Book, is here restored (Chapter III.), but there is less stress laid on doctrine, and less reverence shown in treating of the sacraments. The respective positions of the civil and ecclesiastical powers have also undergone a change, and a very vital one. The First Book recognised the people as the source of ecclesiastical power, the Second aimed at creating a hierarchy of ecclesiastical courts, resting on the will of the people as its foundation, but controlling that will in its actual exercise, and altogether independent of the civil magistrate.² “Nothing,” says Burton,³ “can be more perfect than the analysis by which the two ruling powers are separated from each other, and the ecclesias-

¹ *Book of the Univ. Kirk*, p. 219.

² Grub, ii. 224.

³ *Hist.* v. 203.

tical set above the secular. The civil power was entitled to command the spiritual to do its duty ; but then the magistrate was not to have authority to 'execute the censures of the Church, nor yet prescribe any rule how it should be done.' This is to be entirely in the hands of the Church ; and in enforcing it the State is to be the Church's servant, for it is the magistrate's duty 'to assist and maintain the discipline of the Kirk, and punish them civilly that will not obey the discipline of the same.' Thus the State could give no effective orders to the Church, but the Church could order the State to give material effect to its rules and punishments." The spiritual power of the keys, which, it says, "our Master gave to the apostles and their true successors," is also carefully safeguarded in Chapter X. from the usurpation of the civil magistrate. The Patronage Act of 1874 was anticipated by the twelfth chapter, which deprived the Crown and nobles of the right of patronage, and conferred it upon the elders and congregation.

Burton, who remarks that the Constitution of the Kirk with its Assemblies and lesser meetings was a complete adaptation from the ecclesiastical code of the Huguenots, says of the Second Book of Discipline—"It is a document thoroughly French in its conception and tenor. . . . It is, in fact, a revision of the Huguenot discipline adopted at the first national synod of the Reformed Church of France, held at Paris in 1559. It is much shorter than the French document, yet far more complete, and any one comparing the two will find that they bear to each other the relation of a rough draft which has been completed and polished by able hands. The First Book of Discipline is full of controversy and denunciation. Knox presided at its construction, and wherever his hand was it would be against some other.

The Second Book was the work chiefly of Andrew Melville, a man also of strong will and vehement temper, but endowed with a finer sense of decorum and logical aptness."¹

The Second Book of Discipline marked a notable advance in Melville's march to victory; but as yet the divine right of Presbyterianism was not inscribed on his banner. The presbytery, though set up in some districts, was not recognised as an integral part of the Church's constitution. It has been represented as a development of "the weekly exercise," or "prophesying," which had largely fallen into abeyance; but "the exercise bore less resemblance to the presbytery than the superintendent to the bishop."² Time, however, only was wanting to complete the presbyterial polity by the addition of this important link to its chain of ecclesiastical courts.

The death of Boyd, who had been troublesome as the titular archbishop of Glasgow, involved the Church through his successor in a disgraceful squabble which the Melvillians not unnaturally turned to their own advantage. Boyd's successor, Robert Montgomery, minister at Stirling, had hitherto been a violent opponent of Episcopacy. A poorer type of man to fight a battle on any question of principle could hardly have been found, and the manner of his appointment was even worse than the man. The duke of Lennox was bent on seizing the revenues of the archbishopric of Glasgow, and he wanted a pliable incumbent as an accomplice. After others had honourably refused, he found a tool in Montgomery whom he persuaded to accept the title of archbishop and "the yearly payment of 1000 pounds Scots, with some horse corn and poultry," while his Grace was to pocket the revenues of the see. The unblushing simony of the

¹ *Hist.* v. 202, 203.

² Grub, ii. 225.

transaction covered the parties with obloquy and the whole episcopate with odium. It gave rise to the name of "tulchan bishops," which stuck to them for a generation; and the byword still enlivens Scottish humour when disposed to be playful over Episcopacy. The origin of the name tulchan is explained in the following sentence from the speech of Dickson, moderator in the Assembly of 1639—"When a cow will not give her milk, they stuff a calf's skin full of straw and set it down before the cow, and that was called a tulchan. So these bishops, possessing the title and the benefice, without the office, they wist not what name to give them, and so they called them tulchan bishops."¹ Some writers have mixed up indiscriminately the titular and the tulchan bishops; but there is a marked distinction between both their origin and character. The titulars were the creation of Church and State, accepted by both in the Concordat of Leith, probably with a view to a valid Episcopate, and were as a body honourable men, although few of them were distinguished either for learning or for administration. The tulchans, degenerate titulars, were men of straw, clerical calves, the creatures of some worldly patron, like-minded with their masters. An institution may withstand opposition and even persecution, unless it proceed, like that of the duke of Alva in the Netherlands, to extermination; but no institution can long withstand the concentrated ridicule of a nation. And so the nickname of "tulchan"—calf of straw—ultimately proved fatal to the bishops of that stamp.

The personal career of Montgomery is not worth the attention that has been bestowed upon it. In face of the Assembly's inhibition, he appeared in Glasgow to assert his claim to the bishopric, and attempted to pull the

¹ From Peterkin's *Records of the Kirk*, p. 248.

minister out of the cathedral pulpit. When the presbytery of Glasgow met to pronounce decreit against him, they were assailed by the corporation and citizens. In the fray beards were pulled and teeth knocked out, and finally the moderator of the presbytery was locked up in the Tolbooth. In Edinburgh there was another encounter between the local presbytery and the corporation, which ended in Montgomery's being expelled from the city, "men pursuing him with batons, and wives and boys pelting him with stones and rotten eggs." The king had backed the tulchan bishop for the sake of Lennox, but when he heard at Perth of Montgomery's ludicrous expulsion from the capital, he threw himself down on the Inch and gave way to roars of laughter.¹

An extraordinary meeting of the Assembly was held in Edinburgh at the end of June 1582, Melville again being moderator. In his sermon he inveighed against "the bloodie gullie of absolute authority, whereby men intended to pull the crown off Christ's head, and to wring the sceptre out of His hands." Melville's metaphors are mixed, but his meaning is clear. A committee was appointed to lay before the king, who was then at Perth, "the griefs of the Kirk," and its remonstrances against the Council's interference with its jurisdiction. When the document was produced, the earl of Arran demanded with some temper, "Who dare subscribe these treasonable articles?" "We dare," said Melville boldly; whereupon he advanced to the table and signed his name, the others following his example. The resolute bearing of the ministers made both the king and his advisers hesitate before provoking further opposition. The deputation was

¹ Calderwood, iii. 577-634; *Book of the Universal Kirk*, pp. 256-258.

accordingly dismissed with a plausible reply—which did not by any means satisfy the Assembly.¹

Many of the nobles, encouraged by queen Elizabeth, “that old fomentor of sedition,” had recourse at this time to a secret conspiracy for the purpose of undermining the influence of Lennox and Arran. They decoyed the king in August 1582 to Gowrie’s seat at Huntingtower near Perth, where they made him virtually a prisoner, as they also did with Arran who came to his rescue. This affair, known as the Raid of Ruthven, was warmly applauded by the Protestant ministers, who both hated and feared the malign influence of Lennox. Arran was kept in confinement, and Lennox was ordered to leave the country, which he did after many delays.²

In the autumn of this year, 28th September 1582, a once prominent figure in Scottish politics and literature, George Buchanan, died in Edinburgh. For some time he had lived all but forgotten, busy on the *History of Scotland*, his last but not his best work. His closing years were passed in poverty, not discreditable to himself, but less than creditable to his Protestant friends, and to his royal pupil whom he had faithfully tutored and fearlessly birched. Buchanan was buried at the public expense in the Greyfriars’ Churchyard, where a plain stone, long since removed, once marked the grave of Scotland’s greatest classical scholar.³

¹ Calderwood, iii. 628-631.

² *Ibid.* pp. 637-647.

³ Buchanan defamed many public men in his day, and at least one woman, his own sovereign and benefactor, and he has since been repaid in something like his own coin.

Among modern writers, Bellesheim (iii. 264) says that “his personal character can only be called contemptible”; and Hossack in his *Mary Queen of Scots*, ii. 248, stigmatises him as “the prince of literary prostitutes.”

CHAPTER VII

JAMES VI.—FROM 1582 TO FIRST ESTABLISHMENT OF PRESBYTERIANISM IN 1592

Presbyteries deal with titular bishops—Embassy from France, its reception—Ministers and the Raid of Ruthven—Visit of Brown the English sectary—Melville escapes to Berwick—Adamson visits English bishops—Acts of Parliament 1584, "the Black Acts"—Compulsory subscription of the Acts—Adamson and Melville collide—Banished lords and fugitive ministers in London—Their return—Capture of king at Stirling—Balcanqual and the king dispute in the kirk—Mutual excommunications of Adamson and the Melvilles—Presbyterians refuse to pray for queen Mary—Scene in an Edinburgh church—Execution of queen Mary—Attempt to extrude prelates from Parliament—Act of Annexation—Spanish Armada preceded by troops of Jesuits—King James's marriage—Death of Erskine of Dun—Pont of St. Cuthbert's bishop of Caithness—King's reputed speech in favour of Presbytery—Scots ministers favour English Puritans—Death of archbishop Adamson—Assembly of 1592 presents four Articles to Parliament—Titular Episcopacy abolished and Presbytery for the first time established—Review of ecclesiastical polity.

THE Assembly which met at Edinburgh in October 1582, under David Lindsay as moderator, was honoured with two commissioners sent by the king to watch its proceedings. The ministers were implicated in the Raid of Ruthven, and they did not hesitate to confirm their approval of it in the Assembly, and to order all ministers to commend it to their flocks under pain of ecclesiastical censure. An order was also given for the formation of presbyteries in the northern districts; and certain

presbyteries elsewhere had work provided for them, in the citation and trial of the titular archbishop of St. Andrews and six other diocesan prelates. The charges brought against them were of the usual description. After trial and conviction, they were to be remitted from the presbytery to the Assembly. It was here that the iron entered into the souls of the titular bishops—that they were constitutionally bound to obey the Assembly. No bishops in Catholic history were more restricted by the decrees of a General Council than these unhappy titulars were by the laws of the General Assembly. So patent was the object of the Assembly that its leaders never disguised it—namely, to worry the titular bishops out of court, and, if possible, out of official existence.

In the following Assembly, April 1583, further instructions were issued to presbyteries to be diligent in the pursuit of episcopal delinquents. Orders were also passed on the subject of baptism, which show the high prerogatives claimed for the new ministry. Baptism by laymen was now declared to be invalid (the voice of Catholic Christendom had not presumed to say as much), and baptism by men whose ordination was not according to the new protestant pattern was ruled to be no better. Re-baptism was accordingly ordered in both cases.¹

While the king was still virtually a prisoner in the hands of the confederate lords, an embassy, consisting of de Mainville and Fenelon, arrived from France. The ministers at once attacked them in the pulpits, calling the French king a tiger glutted with the blood of God's saints, and declaiming specially against Fenelon, who, as a knight of the order of St. Esprit, wore the badge of a white cross upon his shoulder, which the ministers

¹ Calderwood, iii. 675-689, 705-713; *Book of Univ. Kirk*, pp. 259-277.

stigmatised as the badge of Antichrist.¹ Not content with railing at them in sermons, four of the ministers—Pont, Lawson, Lindsay, and Davidson—remonstrated with the king in person. He answered them that he was bound by the law of nations to use courtesy to all ambassadors, even though they came from the pope or the Turk. James, as his manner was, had interlarded his arguments with more profane swearing than the ministers thought seemly, and the faithful Davidson tarried behind for a private remonstrance. "Sir," said he, "I thought good to advertise you, but not before the rest, that ye swore and took God's name in vain too often in your speeches." James did not resent the merited rebuke, but patted the honest minister kindly on the shoulder, and thanked him for the unusual moderation of his reproof. On the eve of Fenelon's departure the magistrates of Edinburgh entertained him at a banquet. The ministers responded by proclaiming a fast; and while James and his subjects were merry in the hall, the ministers were "crying out all evil, slanderous, and injurious words that could be spoken against France," "and threatening with anathema and excommunication the citizens who had dared to countenance the unhallowed feast."²

On the 25th June 1583, the king made his escape from the thralldom of his captors and threw himself into St Andrews castle.³ Arran was recalled to Court, and a proclamation was issued declaring the Raid of Ruthven to be treason, but holding out pardon to the accomplices on condition of their submission. Most of them submitted, but it was not so easy for the Kirk to resile from

¹ Teulet, *R. P.* iii. 184-199; 702; *History of James Sext*, pp. Spottiswoode, ii. 297. 196, 197.

² Tytler, vi. 344; Spottiswoode, ii. 297, 298; Calderwood, iii. 697,

³ Teulet, *Papiers*, etc. iii. 355.

its position, nor were the ministers in any humour to do so. Many of them defended the capture of the king as a political necessity. Durie and Melville did so in violent language, the latter warning the king by the examples of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and his ancestor, James III. Durie was relegated to the districts north of the Tay, which was a mild form of banishment in those times.¹ Melville pleaded that his language in the pulpit was to be judged in the first instance by the presbytery, and not by the king's Court, even if it were treasonable; and he is said in the records of the Privy Council to have declared "proudly, irreverently, and contemptuously that the laws of God and the practices observed within this country were perverted, and not observed, in his case."² He was ordered to be warded in Blackness; but he took the advice of his friends and fled to Berwick, the traditional haven of Scottish refugees.

Scotland was favoured in the beginning of this year (1584) with a visit from Robert Brown, the English sectary, who gave his name for a time to the first sectarians in England—the "Brownists." He came from Flanders to Dundee, and was taken in hand by Melville, who was still at St. Andrews. Brown was commended by him to Lawson in Edinburgh, but he soon proved as troublesome to the local presbytery as he had been to the English hierarchy. He refused to submit to their discipline, and when they offered to handle him as they were handling Scottish subjects he, with some inconsistency, threatened an appeal to the civil courts.

Adamson, the titular archbishop, had been busy for some months in England explaining to the bishops and dignitaries there the ecclesiastical situation in Scotland. For the information of his English brethren, as well as

¹ Calderwood, iii. 762-764.

² Spottiswoode, ii. 308, 309.

for a defence of his position at home, Adamson published a summary of his principles containing four articles on the relation of the Crown to the Church, and fifteen on the status of the Christian ministry. The first portion makes "princes chief heads under Christ, as well in ecclesiastical polity as temporal, and their judgment in both to be sovereign." The second claims apostolic institution for the office of bishop, and declares that it is most agreeable to the primitive Church; that ordination and government belong to the bishops; that seniors or elders of the laic sort are neither agreeable with the Scriptures nor with the primitive Church; that presbyteries do little else than make confusion in the Church and continual sedition; that shifting moderators were like shifting wardens among the friars, but like nothing in the earlier ages; that the General Assembly had no power to convene itself, but should be convened by license of the prince upon good and weighty occasions; and, further, should have no power to make laws within the realm but by authority of the prince and the Estates.

Adamson was commissioned by the king to submit the articles to the English bishops for their approval and subscription. Melville was indignant at his rival's movements, —the two men were virtually rival archbishops in Scotland, —and wrote to the Churches of Geneva and Zurich, abusing Adamson in not very ecclesiastical language.¹

A crisis was reached in the Parliament held in Edinburgh, 19th May 1584. James, for several reasons, of which historians give different accounts, had acquired a strong dislike of Presbytery; some say a very early distaste for it, in reaction from the republicanism of his tutor Buchanan. From the Reformation downwards there

¹ Calderwood, iv. 49-55, 157-167; and Melville's *Diary*, pp. 141, 148-164.

had been a continuous struggle between the Church and the Crown as to the lines of demarcation between the two jurisdictions. In this Parliament James set himself to grapple with the troublesome ecclesiastical supremacy claimed by Melville and his supporters. Four Acts were passed, the first of which ratified the ancient jurisdiction of the Three Estates ; the second declared the king to be supreme in all causes and over all persons ; the third enacted that all Convocations must receive the royal license ; and the fourth, that the chief jurisdiction of the Church should be lodged in the hands of the bishops and other commissioners, with authority to visit churches and ministers, reform the colleges, and give collation to benefices.

The University of St. Andrews was supposed to stand in special need of reform from the republican doctrines with which Melville, its principal, had leavened it. The writings of George Buchanan, his *History of Scotland*, and especially his democratic treatise, *De Jure Regni*, were also ordered to be recalled and submitted to the Secretary of State for revision and correction.¹ This was in accordance with many precedents set by the General Assembly in its censorship of the press.

These Acts were not sprung unawares upon the country, although their publication made a very natural commotion among the Melvillians. Lindsay was apprised of their tenor beforehand, and had been appointed by the other ministers, from his influence with the king, to remonstrate with his majesty. Before he could deliver his protest he was seized in his own house on the charge of illegal correspondence with England, and arbitrarily warded in Blackness. Pont and Balcanqual protested at the market cross against the Acts. They did not await

¹ Tytler, vi. 389.

the results of their protestation, but fled precipitately to Berwick, as did also Lawson, the minister of St. Giles'.¹

The Presbyterian writers of that day stigmatised the Acts of 1584 as "The Black Acts," and the pithy epithet has been handed down by successive historians to our own time. The action of the Parliament has been also condemned as arbitrary and tyrannical, although it was supported by several of the leading Reformers, among others by Erskine of Dun, "the most venerable champion of the Kirk."² It may in all historic fairness be represented that the Parliament of 1584, which curtailed the powers of the Assembly and confirmed the principle of Episcopacy, was as free and constitutional as the Parliament of 1560 which overthrew the Roman Catholic hierarchy and established Protestantism in its place. That Parliament never received the sanction of the reigning sovereign, and was open to the charge of illegality which astute lawyers, like Maitland, the chairman, could only evade by a straining of the Constitution. Again, the Parliament of 1592, which supplanted Episcopacy by Presbyterianism, was no more free or constitutional than the Parliament of 1584, which legislated in an opposite direction. It has been too much the fashion with some historians to label things white or black, Acts of Parliament included, according as they promoted or retarded the success of their own cause.

The triumph of Episcopacy in 1584 was brief. Eight years saw another revolution of the ecclesiastical wheel, and the same king, in the Parliament of 1592, sanctioning the establishment, for the first time in Scotland, of a Presbyterian Church. And again, eight years later, the last year of the century witnessed another reversion, the same

¹ *Acts Parl. Scot.* iii. 290-312; woode, ii. 315; Tytler, vi. 390.
Calderwood, iv. 62-73; Spottis- ² Tytler, vi. 430.

king restoring Episcopacy, and nominating three bishops, one of whom was the David Lindsay who had protested against the Episcopacy of 1584. Ministers were sometimes no more consistent than the vacillating king, who earned for himself the reputation and title of "the wisest fool in Christendom."

Following up the enactments of May, a subsequent Parliament in August of the same year ordered all beneficed persons, ministers, readers, masters of colleges and schools, to subscribe the previous Acts under pain of forfeiting their benefices. The ministers between Stirling and Berwick were required to make subscription in Edinburgh before the 16th November. Several who were cited did not appear, and of those who did some would only subscribe with the proviso, so far as the Acts were "agreeable with God's Word," which was permitted.¹

A war of pamphlets and "scurrile poems" now became the order of the day. Adamson was in the field with a treatise on the king's prerogative and the Scriptural constitution of a reformed Episcopacy. Melville answered him with at least equal learning and superior vituperation. Adamson charged Melville with imitating the ways of the pope in claiming exemption from all civil jurisdiction, and in creating a spiritual tyranny by means of the new-fangled presbyteries; he argued in defence of the episcopal office, as having been universal in Christendom from the beginning, and as having existed in Scotland from the very introduction of Christianity into the country until within a few years back, when curious and busy men had invented the novelty of parity among ministers. Melville retaliated with the charge that Episcopacy was only an artifice for introducing a new popedom in the person of the king, and

¹ *Acts Parl. Scot.* iii. 347; Calderwood, iv. 209-211, 246, 247; Spottiswoode, ii. 321.

that for this purpose the jurisdiction assigned by Christ to the Church had been transferred to the bishops who were nothing but cyphers and creatures of the king.¹ The heat of the controversy, like others of its kind, generated personalities. Adamson described Melville as "an ambitious man of a salt and fiery humour"; and Melville retorted by calling Adamson "a juggler, a Howliglass, a drunkard, a vile Epicurean."² In force of language Melville and his backers had the best of it. Each party could see clearly the beam in the other's eye; it is possible, even at a remoter distance, to discern motes in the eyes of both.

The policy of the king in compelling submission to the Acts of Parliament was so far successful that many of the ministers subscribed them, although some who did so hated them all the more heartily for their enforced subscription. One of the fugitive ministers wrote a letter from Berwick to a weak brother who had subscribed. "It told," says Tytler,³ "in homely but expressive phrase that all the ministers betwixt Stirling and Berwick, all Lothian, and all the Merse had subscribed, with only ten exceptions; amongst whom the most noted were Patrick Simpson and Robert Pont; that the Laird of Dun (Erskine), the most venerable champion of the Kirk, had so far receded from his primitive faith as to have become a pest to the ministry in the north; that John Durie, who had so long resisted, had 'cracked his curple' at last, and closed his mouth; that John Craig, so long the coadjutor of Knox, and John Brand, his colleague, had submitted; that the pulpits in Edinburgh were nearly silent—so fearful had been the defection—

¹ Calderwood, iv. 254 *seq.*

² See Spottiswoode, ii. 316, for the letter sent by the fugitive ministers from Edinburgh to its Kirk-

Session, in which they wrote of "the tyrannical regimen of bishops—gross libertines, belly-gods, and infamous."

³ *Hist.* vi. 430.

except, said he, a very few who sigh and sob under the cross."

Three of the Edinburgh ministers—Lawson, Pont, and Balcanqual—were in exile; and Adamson, whose archdiocese included the capital, supplied their place in person and by substitutes. He was an eloquent preacher, and his services were not unacceptable in Edinburgh, although the citizens bore him a grudge for an accredited share in the banishment of their ministers. Two ministers in Edinburgh, Watson and Gibson, were warded in Blackness for violent abuse of the king, and Dalglish, Pont's substitute in St. Cuthbert's, was, upon slighter warrant, committed to the Tolbooth. Tyrannical as the king was, some allowance must be made for him in consideration of foul-mouthed fanatics like Gibson, who were restrained by no sense of decency or loyalty from the most seditious and abusive language. The presbytery did not restrain its unruly members; and the Court was often goaded into retaliation when forbearance would have been the wiser policy.¹

The fugitive ministers lived to return to Edinburgh—but not all of them. Lawson took the troubles of the Church so much to heart that he fell ill and died in London. His life for the last twelve years had been spent as minister of St. Giles', to which he was called from the principalship of Aberdeen college, his induction being the last public act of John Knox. He was a well-read and scholarly man, of peaceable disposition, though said to have been too easily swayed by the popular voice. In the previous year (1583) his successor in the office of principal, Alexander Arbuthnot, of the house of Arbuthnot, in the Mearns, died in Aberdeen. He received his earlier education in Lawson's company, and afterwards

¹ Spottiswoode, ii. 321, 335.

went to France, where he studied for five years under the learned Cujacius. He was a man of wide erudition, reputed to be "a good poet, mathematician, philosopher, theologian, lawyer, and in medicine skilful." "The admirable Crichton" had just dazzled the world like a meteor with his brilliant gifts—he died in 1582,—and Arbuthnot's reputation among his own countrymen stood only second to his. Another scholar who died in this year was Thomas Smeaton, the successor of Melville as principal of Glasgow college. He was a native of Gask, near Perth, a student at St. Salvator's in St. Andrews, and then at Paris; a Jesuit for some years until after his residence in Geneva, where he changed his opinions and became a Protestant. He was an excellent linguist, and well read in the Fathers, owing the latter accomplishment most probably to his foreign education. Both Arbuthnot and Smeaton added lustre to their universities; but as men of the study, mixing little in the debates of Assemblies, their names are less known than those of Lawson and the other leading ministers. All the three men died in middle life; Lawson at forty-six, Arbuthnot at forty-five, and Smeaton at forty-seven.¹

In November 1585 the country went through the throes of another revolution. In the train of the young duke of Lennox came a handsome and accomplished Scot, known as the Master of Gray, son of the baron of that name, who soon became a favourite at Court. The king himself was ungainly in person, his ugliness being, as Burton says, offensive; but, like queen Elizabeth, he "liked to look upon a handsome man." The new favourite was more handsome than Arran, and still more unprin-

¹ Spottiswoode, ii. 318-320, gives a generous account of their learning and virtues, which is a happy contrast to the style of the Presbyterian

historian Calderwood, when writing of public men of the opposite school. See, for example, his abuse of Adamson.

cipld. In all his dealings, but especially in his betrayal of queen Mary, there is revealed a depth of villainy unmatched in that unscrupulous age. One of his first objects was to undermine the influence of Arran and, if possible, work his ruin. For this purpose a league was formed with the banished lords in England, with the connivance of the English Court, which had a hand in every northern conspiracy. The fugitive ministers were also privy to the league, and met the banished lords in London ; and Calderwood tells how, on the eve of the proposed expedition, the ministers "kept a very earnest exercise of humiliation at Westminster, where many tears were poured out before the Lord."¹ In a short time the barons marched northwards to Stirling with their forces, and by a *coup d'état* captured the town, the castle, and the king. Arran made his escape. The king was an early adept in hypocrisy, and when they professed on bended knees that they had come to do him homage and to protect him, he accepted their professions as if he believed them.²

The fugitive ministers speedily followed the banished lords across the border. They gathered at Dumfries, and attempted to hold a meeting in the town, but were expelled ; they then moved north to Linlithgow, where they waited to see what good fortune the change of government would bring them. They waited in vain. The nobles, while profuse in promises, were busy securing their own interests. The ministers were left out in the cold, and the king called them a "pack of seditious knaves." With this experience of the wisdom of the Scriptural admonition not to put their trust in princes, they returned to their several charges. Balcanqual again occupied his old pulpit in Edinburgh, and shortly afterwards (January 1586), when he had the king among his audience, he

¹ *Hist.* iv. 381.

² Spottiswoode, ii. 330, 334.

discoursed upon the unlawfulness of bishops. James, who believed himself an expert theologian, rose from his seat and challenged the preacher, offering to pledge his crown that he could prove the lawfulness of Episcopacy. The unseemly altercation went on between the royal pew and the pulpit. There is a fine touch of the ludicrous in the picture, and it may be safely said that no other country but Scotland could have produced it.

Melville had also returned to St. Andrews, and was moving on the old lines against Episcopacy and its leading representative, Adamson. The Provincial Synod of Fife had not met for two years; it was now summoned to censure the bishop, but there were doubts about the proper procedure. At last it was agreed to cite Adamson in the afternoon, and when he compeared they accused him of being the author of the Acts of 1584, of penning the declaration published by the king, and of slandering the brethren in his embassy to England. The bishop refuted the several charges, while reminding them that they were not his judges, and appealing his case to the Council, or to the Three Estates of the realm, or to any other lawful assembly convened by his majesty. By a majority of two they agreed to excommunicate him, but neither the moderator nor any other member would pronounce the sentence. As they were dissolving, "a young fellow, named Mr. Andrew Hunter, willed them to stay, professing that he was warned by the Spirit to pronounce the sentence; and so, ascending the chair, he read the same out of a book, a few only remaining as witnesses." Hunter was a servant of Melville, and the strange proceeding was parodied next day by two of the bishop's servants going with his cousin to the same church in the time of prayer and excommunicating Andrew and James Melville and some other members of synod.

On neither side probably were the parties much hurt by the excommunications, although the cause of religion must have suffered from the discreditable scenes.¹ Adamson's case came up on appeal in the Assembly held in Edinburgh, 10th May 1586. The king was present, and gave his vote for his favourite, David Lindsay, as moderator. Adamson made a qualified submission to the Assembly, influenced by the king, who was anxious to avoid an open rupture with the ministers. The sentence against the bishop was not withdrawn, but ignored as never having been pronounced. Melville entered his protest against the compromise, though it was really a victory for his party, and fatal to the cause of titular Episcopacy.²

The attention of Scotsmen was withdrawn for a time from the wranglings of Church courts to public events in England. It was known towards the end of 1586 that Elizabeth and her Council had resolved upon the execution of queen Mary. She had been mixed up—pardonably, as most will allow—in various schemes for deliverance from a long captivity which was as unjustifiable as it was cruel, seeing that Mary had been guilty of no offence against the Crown of England. The Babington conspiracy implicated her in a graver plot against the life of Elizabeth; and Mary's letters, interpolated by forgeries, were used as evidence of her guilt.³ The shifts and devices resorted to by Elizabeth and her legal advisers, Burghley, Walsingham, and Davison, are the best vindication of Mary's innocence of the capital charge on which she was con-

¹ Calderwood, iv. 494-547; Spottiswoode, ii. 337-340; Melville's *Diary*, pp. 245-247.

² Calderwood, iv. 547-583; Spottiswoode, ii. 341-343; *Book of Univ. Kirk*, pp. 289-313.

³ See Teulet, *Papiers d'Etat*, iii. 433 *seq.* for Babington's assurance that the plot was known only by two others besides himself. See also p. 458 and note, and pp. 486-491, for falsification of Mary's letters.

demned. James was unnaturally callous to the fate of his mother. It is true he had never seen her since his childhood—Mary's last visit to her son having been made on the ill-starred day when she was captured by Bothwell on her return from Stirling,—and he had been educated under the influence of men, tutors and nobles, whose interest it was to blacken her character. But human nature is the same in the child of prince as of peasant, and the unnatural conduct of James leaves an indelible stain on his memory. The Crown of England was weighed in the balance against the life of his mother ; and though he would willingly have secured both, yet when put to the dilemma he shamefully sacrificed the one to make additionally sure of the other. All that he did was to remonstrate against the violence that threatened his mother, and to send among other envoys to Elizabeth the Master of Gray, a man who had already betrayed Mary, and whose treachery James must have known.¹

The king asked the ministers, but not till three months after her trial, to pray for his mother. All of them, excepting Lindsay and the king's own chaplains, refused. They were asked to pray "that it might please God to illuminate her with the light of His truth, and save her from the apparent danger wherein she was cast,"—a sentiment which might have commended itself even to her enemies. The 3rd of February was appointed for public prayer, and Adamson was asked to officiate ; "which," says Spottiswoode,² "when the ministers understood, they stirred up Mr. John Cowper, a young man not entered as yet in the function, to take the pulpit before the time and exclude the bishop." When the king entered the church and saw the youth in the pulpit he addressed him from his seat :

¹ Teulet, *R. P.* iii. 324 and *Papiers*, etc. iii. 504, 506.

² *Hist.* ii. 356.

"Mr. John, that place is destined for another; yet since you are there, if you will obey the charge that is given and remember my mother in your prayers, you may go on." He replied that he would do as the Spirit of God should direct him, upon which he was ordered to come down. Upon his refusal, the captain of the guard approached him, and Cowper came down, but not before he had told the king that that day should be a witness against him in the last judgment, and had also pronounced a woe upon the inhabitants of Edinburgh.¹ Adamson is said to have discoursed eloquently on the duty of Christians to pray for all men, carrying with him the sympathies of his audience, for "they grieved sore to see their teachers so far overtaken, and condemned their obstinacy in that point."²

Mary was executed at Fotheringay on the morning of the 8th, by new style the 18th, February 1587.³ Her execution sent a thrill of horror through every State in Europe, and aroused a feeling of indignation which, if it did not surprise, certainly alarmed for the time, both Elizabeth and her advisers. The feeling in Mary's native Scotland was still more pronounced, and vengeance was vowed in many a northern home against "the auld enemy." Barons swore that they would sleep in mail until they had wiped out the murder of their queen in a sea of blood.⁴ James was at first stunned by the blow, and refused to see the English ambassador who had been sent with a lying despatch from Elizabeth, throwing the blame "of the miserable accident which has befallen, far contrary to my meaning," on her Secretaries of State who, she alleged, had taken Mary's life without her authority. To sustain the discreditable farce, she accused her councillors

¹ Kirkton's *History*, ed. Sharpe, p. 11, note.

² Spottiswoode, ii. 356.

³ Teulet, *R. P.* iv. 153-164. "Le

vray rapport de l'exécution."—Teulet, *Papiers*, iii. 563, 576.

⁴ See Teulet, *Papiers*, etc. iii. 524, 567.

of having deceived her, drove lord Burghley from her presence, and committed her secretary Davison to the Tower.¹ The hypocritical passion deceived no one, not even James. England had been guilty of a great public crime which all the craft of Elizabeth failed to explain away. The scaffold of Fotheringay and the touching details of that bleak February morning make a weird termination to the most romantic and chequered life in Scottish history, and yet, after all, it was a happier death-bed than awaited her rival and murderer.² Mary's body was buried in Peterborough cathedral beside the remains of queen Katharine, first wife of Henry VIII., and after James's accession to the English throne it was transferred by him for final sepulture in Westminster Abbey. There the ashes lie side by side of the rival queens, Mary and Elizabeth, who never saw each other in life. Such is the irony of history.

Every nation in Europe was against Elizabeth. Henry III. of France (Navarre) only accepted her lame apologies for the judicial murder in expectation of her assistance to crush the League and the princes of Guise.³ It hastened the preparation of the Spanish Armada which sailed in the following year to cripple, if not to conquer, the dominion of England. One miscreant deeply involved in the tragedy failed to receive the due reward of his deeds. The Master of Gray was tried for treason and condemned, but only to exile, when he ought to have forfeited his life for his unpardonable villainy.⁴

¹ Teulet, *Papiers d'Etat*, iii. p. xv., suggests that Elizabeth's hypocrisy deserves further investigation. See also, iii. 540, 568.

² For Elizabeth's death-bed see Tytler, vii. 473-475; Teulet, *R. P.* iv. 291-293; *Papiers*, iii. 687; Miss Strickland's *Queens of England*, vii. 284, *seq.*; and Green's *History of*

the English People, ii. 499.

³ The preacher in St. Eustache, Paris, was stopped in his sermon on queen Mary's death by the sympathetic commotion of the people.—Teulet, *Papiers*, iii. 556.

⁴ Tytler, vii. 133; Teulet, *R. P.* iv. 203.

In the Parliament of July 1587, affairs of some moment to the Church were transacted. It had been a standing grievance of the Assembly that the prelates continued their Parliamentary duties as one of the Three Estates, and took part in the legislation of the Kingdom. Seeing that they had ceased to represent the Spirituality, the contention of the Assembly was reasonable, whether prompted by jealousy or not. But it was felt that the political constitution of the country was too delicate a machine to be remodelled in the face of forces palpitating with revolution. Commissioners from the Church appeared in Parliament, and demanded that the prelates should be extruded from their seats. The abbot of Kinloss defended the rights of the prelatic order and turned the attack upon the ministers who, he said, not content with having driven them from the altar, were now scheming to banish them from the senate. The attack failed for the time, and prelates, including the bishops, continued to sit in Parliament.¹

The ministers, however, had their full satisfaction in another way. An Act of Annexation was passed which stripped the bishops of their episcopal revenues and left them as poor as the parochial ministers. All the temporalities of the bishoprics were annexed to the Crown; and thus the last acre of the Church's patrimony passed out of its hands, leaving the bishops nothing but the palaces and their share of the tithes. This ill-advised act was prompted by the chronic poverty of the Crown. The king would not practise the economy of his grandfather, James V., and make royal ends meet by stocking the Crown lands with cattle; and the condition of the

¹ The king, after his mother's death, restored the rights, temporal and spiritual, of their sees, to archbishop Beaton and bishop Leslie for their fidelity to queen Mary. (Teulet, *Papiers*, etc. iii. 572). Beaton said of Leslie that he was "un homme leger et un grand parleur."

country did not warrant the modern expedient of filling an empty exchequer by taxation. Robbing the Church seemed the only alternative, but the Crown was no richer in the end, for James, in his easy good nature, beset by needy and greedy courtiers, yielded to the general scramble the last of the ecclesiastical lands. He lived to regret his share in this sacrilege, and, when a few years later he was bent on restoring Episcopacy, he stigmatised the Annexation in his *Basilikon Doron*¹ as "a vile and pernicious Act."²

The year 1588 was memorable for the long-threatened expedition of the Spanish Armada, which was proudly styled invincible. Troops of Jesuits and seminary priests preceded it both in England and Scotland, endeavouring to rouse the Roman Catholic nobility to make common cause with Spain in the invasion of England.³ Overtures were made to James to permit the entrance of the fleet into Scottish harbours, as near as possible to the borders, and asking him to co-operate with the Spaniards in wresting the crown from Elizabeth. James hesitated for a moment, but his Scottish caution suggested that his own way to the throne of England did not lie through a Spanish conquest of that country.⁴

There was little need for Scotland to intermeddle. Of the hundred and thirty-four ships that sailed from Lisbon, only fifty-three returned to Spain, the rest being captured or wrecked on the coasts of Britain and Ireland. There was not the same cause for rejoicing here as in England, but the king appointed a day of thanksgiving in all the churches of his kingdom. The Assembly was busy, it could not be an idle spectator of the invasion

¹ Book ii. p. 43.

² Spottiswoode, ii. 376.

³ Teulet, *Papiers*, etc. iii. 484.

⁴ For the claim of Philip II. of Spain to the English throne, see Teulet, *Papiers*, etc. iii. 423-425.

of the country by "papish idolaters," and sharp measures were taken with the race of Jesuits and foreign intriguers.¹ One result of the Jesuits' intrigue was the northern rebellion of Huntly and others, which was quelled by James marching at the head of his troops to Aberdeen, a remarkable achievement for a monarch who could hardly bear the sight of a naked sword.

James had now completed his twenty-third year, and his thoughts had lately turned to matrimony. A marriage was arranged with the princess Anna, daughter of the king of Denmark and Norway. The bride was to have been married in Scotland, but the storms raised by the Scottish witches, so the people believed, baffled every effort of the Danish sailors to cross the North Sea even in summer. The disappointment of the nation vented itself upon the unfortunate witches; but burning and drowning witches did not bring James's bride-elect any nearer to his bosom; and, at last, losing all patience, he ventured upon the only romance of his life and sailed for "Norroway over the foam." David Lindsay accompanied the king as chaplain, and the marriage was performed by him at Upsal (now Christiania) on the 24th November 1589. There was a long winter of feasting and drinking; and James, young as he was, could hold his own over the wine cups with any son of the Vikings. He was not a drunkard in the sense of giving way to bouts of intemperance, as was the manner of many of his countrymen, but he sotted himself with frequent imbibings which only a robust constitution could have withstood.²

¹ For the schemes of the Jesuits at this time, see Spottiswoode, ii. 392-398, and Teulet, *Papiers*, etc. iii. 412-417, for letters from Huntly, Hamilton, and Morton to the king of Spain on the project to establish the Roman

Catholic religion in Scotland.

² James found time to visit the celebrated Danish astronomer Tycho Brahe at Uranibourg, and to discuss predestination with the learned Hemmingius.—Tytler, vii. 153.

What was probably the longest marriage feast on record had an end, and James returned with his young wife to Leith in April. She was crowned queen of Scotland in Holyrood on the 17th May. There was a difficulty about the coronation similar to that which arose on the occasion of his own coronation as a child at Stirling. The anointing which the king insisted upon was declared to be Jewish, superstitious, and popish, and the protestant ministers would have none of it. James with his natural shrewdness overcame their scruples by hinting that he would send for the bishops. "The dread of this worse profanation," says Tytler, "procured the admission of the lesser," and so the ceremony proceeded. The queen was anointed by Robert Bruce, the king's latest favourite, who had recently come into prominence as one of the ministers in Edinburgh.¹

In the year 1590 died John Erskine of Dun, one of the leading Reformers of 1560. "He was," says Grub,² "one of the most estimable men of his time; steadily attached to the protestant opinions, and maintaining them consistently and courageously, he was always opposed to violent and extreme measures." He was a zealous supporter of the principle of Episcopacy, and advocated it consistently to the end of his life.

Robert Pont of St. Cuthbert's, who was the only minister permitted by the Assembly to act as senator of the College of Justice, was nominated by the king to the vacant bishopric of Caithness. The acceptance of the king's offer by Pont shows that there was a moderate party among the protestant ministers not averse to the episcopal polity. His position as a judge in the Court of Session made him less open to the charge of

¹ Calderwood, v. 67, 72; Spottiswoode, ii. 399-408; Tytler, vii. 154.

² *Hist.* ii. 247.

ambition, all the more that the office of bishop was now stripped of almost everything but its official character.¹

James Melville, preaching before the Assembly that met in August 1590, claimed the victory as won for the Presbyterian cause. King James is credited, but on very slender authority, with a speech at this Assembly which, genuine or not, is in its way a curiosity. "He fell forth praising God that he was born in such a time as the time of the light of the gospel, to such a place as to be king in such a Kirk, the sincerest Kirk in the world. The Kirk of Geneva," it continues, "keepeth Pasch and Yule : what have they for them? they have no institution. As for our neighbour Kirk in England, it is an evil said mass in English, wanting nothing but the liftings. I charge you, my good people, ministers, doctors, elders, nobles, gentlemen, and barons, to stand to your purity and to exhort the people to do the same; and I, forsooth, so long as I brook my life and crown, shall maintain the same against all deadly." Great applause is said to have greeted the royal oration; and the Assembly "praised God and prayed for the king for a quarter of an hour." The earliest authority for the speech is Scot,² who is copied almost verbatim by Calderwood,³ but Spottiswoode and Melville (the preacher on the occasion and the author of "The Diary") fail to mention it. The speech is so inconsistent with James's policy before and after this date, and with his known relations to Elizabeth and the Anglican Church at that time, that its genuineness may well be questioned. The option lies between the genuineness of the speech and the sincerity of the speaker; and, truth being told, there is not much to be said for either.

¹ Calderwood, iv. 398, 615-634; *Book of Univ. Kirk*, pp. 314-322.

² Scot's *Apologetical Narration*, p. 57.

³ *Hist.* v. 100-111.

The puritans, who were now giving trouble to Elizabeth in England, had many sympathisers among the ministers in Scotland. They sheltered Penry the puritan when driven from England, and prayed publicly for their persecuted English brethren. Elizabeth protested that this was "a scandal on her sincere government," and asked James to "stop the mouths or make short the tongues" of the ministers, and to banish from his land "vagabond traitors and seditious inventors." James duly complied.¹ What would have been the condition of Scotland and the fate of the ministers if not a Mary or a James but the dauntless Tudor herself had been their sovereign? There was really nothing to choose between the doctrinal platform of the English puritans and that of the Melvillian ministers. In 1589 Dr. Bancroft, in a famous sermon at St. Paul's Cross, assailed the Puritan and Presbyterian systems as the novel creation of Calvin; and at once the Scottish ministers were in arms to answer him.² The presbytery of Edinburgh was specially active, and drew up a memorial to queen Elizabeth "to take order with Mr. Doctor Bancroft for that infamous sermon preached by him at Paul's Cross, traducing in it the whole discipline of the Church of Scotland." Probably the thought of their inconsistency in appealing to the English queen, seeing how little deference they paid to their own sovereign in matters ecclesiastical, made them withhold their protest.

Bancroft also wrote a letter to Adamson, expressing his surprise that he had not again visited the English

¹ *Calendar State Papers Scot.* ii. 579-581.

² Bancroft continued the controversy, and wrote two other publications whose titles are an index of their contents—"A Survey of the

pretended Holy Discipline," and "Dangerous Positions and Proceedings, published and practised within this Island of Britain, under pretence of Reformation, and for the Presbyterian Discipline."

bishops who were ready to receive him in conference. The letter was intercepted, but even had it reached its destination the titular archbishop was not in a state of health to undertake the journey. He had again been excommunicated by the Kirk for marrying, at the request of the king, the popish earl of Huntly to a sister of the duke of Lennox; it being evidently the idea of the ministers that papists were not entitled to matrimony, except on renouncing their faith. The excommunicated man now lay on his death-bed, impoverished and neglected, as had been the fate of others—George Buchanan, for example—who had honourably served the king. "James had too much in common with those animals of the baser sort who drive the stricken brother from the herd."¹ Adamson had been lavish of his money, while he had it, in the interests of the Church; and his enemies accused him of being not less lavish of it in prelatic display. He was now left in a condition of abject poverty; for the king had shamefully withdrawn the revenues of his see to confer them upon the young duke of Lennox.² Broken in health and bankrupt—"put to the horn" by his creditors—his reason partially failed him. In this pitiable state he was driven to ask the help of his rival, Andrew Melville. The charity would have been twice blessed had it not been for the recantation of his episcopal principles which the dying man with shattered powers was constrained to make. Spottiswoode says that "when it was told him that such a recantation was being published in his name, he complained heavily of the wrong that was done him;"³ but all the same, the recantation was paraded before the next Assembly as the dying confession of the archbishop.⁴

¹ Burton, v. 298.

² Calderwood, v. 118.

³ II. 415.

⁴ Dr. Rankine, Story's ed. *Ch. of*

Adamson, who died at the close of the year 1591, did not live to see the overthrow of the episcopal polity he had striven so hard to secure for Scotland. The Assembly met on the 21st May 1592, and at once moved an address to Parliament for the repeal of the Acts of 1584—"the Black Acts." The moment was opportune; the moderator, Bruce, was for the time the favourite minister at Court, and James had special reasons for seeking at this juncture the good-will of the ministers. He was compromised by the escapades of his "mad cousin," the new earl of Bothwell,¹ and he had incurred no little odium by shielding the earl of Huntly from public indignation for his barbarous murder of "the bonnie earl of Moray"—the revenge of the third generation for the affair at Corrichie.

Parliament met in June, when four Articles from the Assembly were presented, craving, 1st, That the Acts of Parliament passed in 1584, against the discipline of the Church and liberty thereof, should be repealed, and a ratification granted of the discipline previously in use. 2nd, That the Act of Annexation should be repealed, and restitution made of the Church's patrimony. 3rd, That the abbots, priors, and other prelates bearing the titles of Churchmen, and giving voice for the Church without any commission therefrom, should cease to sit in Parliament

Scot. ii. 465-467, after remarking that "Archbishop Adamson is a man who has by no means had justice at the hands of Presbyterian historians and critics," adds—"The so-called Recantation which clouded his last days, in 1591, seems to have been mainly a fraudulent or semi-fraudulent trick played upon a feeble and dying man by the same triumphant persecutors, so that the shame of it is theirs and not his." Boyd, titular archbishop of Glasgow, was wiser than Adamson by taking precaution against being misrepresented after his

death through any imputed confession. Dr. Gordon in his *Scotchchronicon*, ii. 321-338, gives a full account of Adamson's career and numerous writings, including the elegant Latin poem, "O, Anima!" said to have been written on his death-bed. If so, he must have had lucid intervals.

¹ The sister of the notorious Bothwell had married one of the bastard sons of James V., and their son was this turbulent youth on whom James VI. had conferred his uncle's title.

or Convention. 4th, That a solid order might be taken for purging the realm of idolatry and blood wherewith it was miserably polluted.¹

The second and third Articles were rejected without much discussion. The second suggests a foible of human nature which deserves a passing notice. The ministers had no objection to the same Acts of Annexation—the Assembly was silent—when the bishops were being robbed of the old episcopal lands ; but now that they petition for the abolition of Episcopacy, the ministers follow it up with a demand for the restitution of the Church's patrimony to themselves. The fourth Article was answered by penalties against Jesuits, masses, and mass-priests, but with a lenient proviso that "if the Jesuits and seminary priests did satisfy the prince and the Church," the penalties should not be imposed. The first Article was the vital one, and the discussion on it was prolonged. Spottiswoode says the king was unwilling either to abrogate the Acts of 1584 or to grant the ratification desired of the presbyterial discipline. In the end the king gave way. The power that had been given to the bishops was expressly repealed, presentations to benefices were made subject to the control of the presbyteries, and the "full liberties, privileges, and immunities of the Church" were ratified. General Assemblies were also allowed to meet once a year, or oftener on emergency, the time and place being fixed by the king, or his commissioner, failing which by the members of Assembly.²

Melville had triumphed ; titular Episcopacy was abolished, and Presbyterianism in an exact historic sense was, for the first time, established in Scotland. The civil rights

¹ Spottiswoode, ii. 420.

Diary, pp. 294-298 ; Spottiswoode,

² *Acts Parl. Scot.* iii. 541, 542 ;
Calderwood, v. 156-166 ; Melville's

ii. 420, 421.

of the bishops and other prelates were untouched, but their ecclesiastical authority was gone. This important Act has been described as the Magna Charta of Presbyterianism, and as legalising the most essential parts of the Second Book of Discipline. As a matter of fact this Book of Discipline is not so much as alluded to in the Act, and it remains without Parliamentary sanction to this day.¹

In closing this stage of the ecclesiastical struggle, it may be observed, first, that not much can be said for the titular episcopate, except that it was a recognition of the principle of Episcopacy. Reformers like Erskine of Dun maintained this through good and evil report; and even Knox acquiesced in the episcopate on the ground of expediency. Second, the use of a liturgy continued; the English Prayer Book in the earlier years, and Knox's Book more generally in the later; but along with both, free use of extempore prayer according to the abilities or predilections of the minister. Third, the administration of sacramental communion was by Knox's Book to be quarterly, though it probably never was so in practice. Fourth, from the absence of any mention of surplice or gown, and from the Act of Parliament, June 1609, ordering ministers to wear black gowns in pulpits, and bishops and doctors of divinity to wear black gowns, cassocks, and tippets, it would appear that no ministerial vestments were used in the ordinances of religion. The Scottish ministers protested in Knox's day against the use of vestments in the Church of England, and they did so again in the time of Adamson, which is additional evidence that in Scotland during the thirty years following the Reformation the ministers of both sections officiated in their ordinary wearing apparel. Fifth, a more serious

¹ Grub, ii. 261; Cunningham, i. 479.

defect than the disuse of vestments was the rejection of the Christian Year,—the time-honoured fast and festival of the Catholic Church, which from the days of St. Ninian and St. Columba had been largely instrumental in teaching the Scottish people the cardinal facts of man's redemption. The Church in Scotland at this time stood alone in Christendom in its renunciation of holy days and seasons, more protestant in that than even Geneva; for, as we have seen, "Geneva kept Pasch and Yule," while Scotland in her fanaticism had swept even these away.

CHAPTER VIII

REIGN OF JAMES VI.—FROM THE FIRST ESTABLISHMENT OF PRESBYTERIANISM IN 1592 TO THE UNION OF THE CROWNS IN 1603

Presbyterians petition Parliament for the aid of the Civil Power—Romanists implicated in the "Spanish Blanks"—Persecution of Romanists—Argyll's defeat by Huntly in Glenlivet—The king and the Presbyterian ministers march against Huntly—The appeal of Jesuit Gordon to the Romanists in Elgin cathedral—The ministers reprove the king and his Court—Andrew Melville's speech to the king at Falkland—Melville's second appearance at Falkland—Intemperate speeches of other ministers—Riot in Edinburgh—King removes court to Linlithgow—Seditious language of ministers—Calderwood's picture of Presbyterian Church in 1596—Meeting of Estates and of Assembly in Perth—King's proposals—Resolutions adopted—Assembly at Dundee—King's ecclesiastical commission and further resolutions in favour of Episcopacy—Assembly at Montrose in 1600 completes the scheme—King's book *Basilikon Doron* and Melville's action thereanent—The Kirk and the theatre—Gowrie conspiracy—New titular bishops—Work of Assembly at Burntisland 1601—Deaths of leading ministers—King and Court remove to London.

THE Presbyterians were now in possession, but they found it difficult to maintain their ascendancy without statutory powers against their opponents. Their application to Parliament was answered by an Act in 1593 "for punishment of the contemners of the decreets and judicatories of the Kirk." The said judicatories were accordingly authorised to apply to the lords of Session or the Secret Council for letters of horning, with all their

ruinous consequences, against the contemners of the Kirk.¹

The scare arising from the discovery of "the Spanish Blanks" further alarmed the Presbyterians, and provoked their ministers to urge the severest measures against the papists. George Ker, brother of the abbot of Newbattle, was suspected of illegal trafficking with Spain, and was captured at the isle of Cumbræ while on board a ship about to sail for the Continent. On being put to torture by the king's command, he confessed the conspiracy. Among his papers were found certain blank letters signed by the earls of Huntly, Angus, and Errol.² The discovery irritated both king and people, and James issued a proclamation commanding all papists to depart from Edinburgh within three days on pain of death. Angus was seized in Edinburgh and imprisoned, but managed to escape from the castle. Huntly and Errol were ordered to ward themselves in St. Andrews before the 5th February 1593. The earls were not so disposed, and by the end of the month James was on his way at the head of a small force to Aberdeen. Huntly and his friends retreated to the wilds of Caithness. The protestant lords expected the forfeiture of the three earls' estates, and were already dividing the spoil. The ministers were equally urgent that no mercy should be shown them, and when James would have been lenient on grounds of policy, knowing the power of the northern earls, they declaimed against him in their pulpits and declared him to be a papist at heart.³ Their fanaticism broke out in the following Assembly at Dundee (April 1593) where they presented four petitions to the king, demanding the extermination of the papists. Had James complied with the petitions

¹ *Acts Parl. Scot.* iv. 16; Burton, v. 279; Tytler, vii. 168.

² Spottiswoode, ii. 425, 426.

³ Calderwood, v. 251.

the result must have been a general massacre of the Roman Catholics,—a St. Bartholomew's day in Scotland.¹

The moderation of the king gave much offence to a section of the Kirk. They sent commissioners to the Parliament which met in Edinburgh Tolbooth in July 1593 to urge his Majesty to extreme measures against the Roman Catholics; and when he still withheld his hand they railed at him in their sermons and stigmatised the Parliament as a "black Parliament in which iniquity had taken the place of equity." The synod of Fife took upon itself to excommunicate the popish nobles and gentry on the plea that they had come within its jurisdiction either from having studied at St. Andrews or married wives from Fife. The king was indignant at the presumption of the synod, and remarked that they had given him no rest until he had established their polity, and now he should find no rest until he took them in hand and reformed them.² Melville afterwards defended their proceedings before the king, offering to go to the gibbet if he did not prove the treasonable practices of the popish nobles against the Church and the Kingdom; upon which the king and his courtiers smiled and remarked that the minister was more zealous and cholerick than wise.³

When James was in the south of Scotland, quelling chronic disturbances on the border, the popish earls met him at Fala, asserted their innocence of the Spanish conspiracy, and craved the right of a public trial. The question was finally remitted to a mixed committee in Edinburgh, five of the ministers being admitted to its meetings. In the month of November they gave their deliverance: (1) That the established religion should be the only

¹ See Dr. Cunningham's *Hist. Ch. Scot.* i. 515, 516.

tiswoode, ii. 437, 438.

² Calderwood, v. 261-263; Spot-

³ Calderwood, v. 288, 289, 309; Melville's *Diary*, p. 313.

religion professed by his Majesty's subjects, and that all who did not conform before 1st February 1594, must be banished the realm; (2) That the accused nobles and gentry should be exonerated from the charge of complicity in the Spanish Blanks, provided they conformed to the Presbyterian Church, banished Jesuits and other papists from their presence, avoided speaking against the established religion at their tables, received a Presbyterian minister into their houses to instruct them in religion and prepare them for signing the Confession of Faith.¹ No more tyrannical statute was ever passed than this which allowed only the cruel alternative of abandoning either creed or country, and no more intolerable system of espionage can well be conceived than quartering upon Roman Catholic households the ministers of a hated and hostile religion.²

Some little relief from polemical strife was afforded by the national rejoicings over the birth of a prince on the 19th February 1594. He was baptized, six months afterwards, in the chapel royal at Stirling, by the name of Frederick Henry, the sacrament being administered by Cunningham, titular bishop of Aberdeen, in spite of the vigorous protest of the presbytery of Edinburgh.³

The troubles with the northern earls were not yet ended. The youthful earl of Argyll volunteered to raise the western clans and march northwards to chastise his powerful rival, Huntly. From Lorn and Lochaber the Highlanders mustered, to the number of ten thousand, and marched across the water-shed of the Spey and down its banks until they met Huntly with a much smaller force in Glenlivet. A battle was fought on the 4th October, which resulted in the rout of Argyll's undisciplined rabble.

¹ Calderwood, v. 284; Spottiswoode, ii. 443-445.

² Burton, *Hist.* v. 303; Cuning-

ham, *Ch. Hist. Scot.* i. 523.

³ Calderwood, v. 343-346; Spottiswoode, ii. 455, 466.

Argyll carried the news of his defeat to the king in Dundee, and James hastened his preparations for another northern campaign. He invited the two Melvilles and some other ministers to accompany him and witness his zeal against the popish earls. The ministers, we read, "cased themselves in corselets and marched with the host." Mediæval bishops delighted in donning a coat of mail; but few would recognise Andrew Melville clad in carnal armour, though it seems to have been nothing unusual with him and others of his brethren.¹ The ministers had to aid the would-be martial monarch in other ways. His exchequer was exhausted, and the presbytery of Edinburgh supplied him with the sinews of war.² In this respect both belligerents were on an equal footing, as pope Clement VIII. had sent considerable sums to support Huntly and Errol.³ James pushed on to Strathbogie Castle, the stronghold of Huntly, but the earl, now marquis, had retreated as formerly to Caithness. The castles of Strathbogie, Slains, and other places, were levelled to the ground. Father Gordon, a Jesuit and the uncle of Huntly, attempted to rally the northern Romanists once more, and met them in Elgin, where the last mass was celebrated in the cathedral in the spring of 1595. The Jesuit implored them from the pulpit to make one more stand for their holy religion, but the nobles had lost heart, and both Huntly and Errol presently left Scotland for the Continent.⁴

James returned from the camp to find troubles in the Court. The queen was dissatisfied that the earl of Mar instead of herself should have the keeping of the infant prince. Her displeasure led to estrangement between the royal consorts, and it taxed all the efforts of the ministers

¹ Melville's *Diary*, p. 214.

² *Ibid.* pp. 214-216.

³ Bellesheim, iii. 323, and Ap-

pendix IV. p. 449.

⁴ Melville's *Diary*, pp. 318, 319; Tytler, vii. 288.

to reconcile them. Their fussy interference with the Court life at Holyrood also added to the prevalent irritation. They sent a deputation to the king to confer with him on his own sins and the sins of his household ; and in a schedule of complaints they referred specially to the late hours and balls of the queen and her gentlewomen.¹ James resented the intermeddling of the ministers, but he kept his temper and returned the soft answer, that if they had occasion to rebuke him they would please do it in private and not from their pulpits.

In August 1596 there was a meeting of the Estates at Falkland, to discuss the recalling of Huntly and the other exiled lords. A deputation of ministers was sent, and Melville, though not a member of it, went with them. James sought to exclude him, but he was irrepressible. His speech on the occasion is a good sample of Melville's manner. "Sir," he said to the king, "I have a calling to come here by Christ Jesus the King and His Kirk, who has special interest in this business, and against which directly this convention is met ; charging you and your Estates in His name, and of His Kirk, that you favour not His enemies whom He hates, nor go about to call home and make citizens those that have traitorously sought to betray their city and native country to the cruel Spaniard, with the overthrow of Christ's kingdom, for the which they have been therefore most justly cut off as rotten members ; certifying, if they should do in the contrary, they should feel the dint of the wrath of that King and His Estates." There was more to the same effect. The whole speech is flavoured with such assumption of a special knowledge of Christ's mind, and of his own assured infallibility, that no papal bull could exceed it in arrogance. The king ordered Melville's departure from

¹ Calderwood, v. 459 ; Burton, v. 304, 305.

the Council ; and he at length obeyed, " thanking God that they had known his mind and got His message discharged."¹

In the following September the Assembly met at Cupar, in Fife. It was but a few miles from Falkland, where the king was residing, and a deputation, consisting of the two Melvilles and two other ministers, favoured him with a visit. The younger Melville, who was minister of Anstruther, being a man of smoother tongue than his uncle, was made spokesman. The king quickly interrupted him, saying that the meeting at Cupar was without warrant and seditious. What followed had better be described in the words of the reporter, James Melville : " I, beginning to reply in my manner, Mr. Andrew (Melville) could not abide it, but broke off upon the king in so zealous, powerful, and irresistible a manner that howbeit the king used his authority in most crabbed and choleric manner, yet Mr. Andrew bore him down and uttered the commission as from the mighty God, calling the king but ' God's silly vassal ' ; and taking him by the sleeve says this in effect through much hot reasoning and many interruptions, ' Sir, we will humbly reverence your majesty ' always—namely, in public. But since we have this occasion to be with your majesty in private, and the truth is, you are brought in extreme danger both of your life and crown, and with you the country and Kirk of Christ is like to wreck for not telling you the truth and giving of you a faithful counsel,—we must discharge our duty therein or else be traitors both to Christ and you. And therefore, sir, as divers times before, so now again I must tell you, there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland. There is Christ Jesus the King and His Kingdom the Kirk, whose subject king James the Sixth is, and of whose Kingdom not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member. And

¹ Melville's *Diary*, p. 368.

they whom Christ has called and commanded to watch over His Kirk and govern His spiritual Kingdom, have sufficient power of Him and authority so to do both together and severally ; the which no Christian king nor prince should control and discharge but fortify and assist, otherwise they are not faithful subjects nor members of Christ.' " ¹

The Falkland scene is a favourite subject with historians, and Melville is lauded by some of them for his courage and faithfulness. It is doubtful how far his principles would be accepted by any church or party to-day, or how far they could be tolerated by any Government that respected itself, and had due regard to the rights and liberties of its subjects. Little courage was needed to browbeat a youth, who, though a king, was politically all but powerless ; and the affair at Falkland dwindles into an exhibition of bad temper on Melville's part.² It was different with the king when seated on the throne by the Thames ; the "silly vassal" could then be as arbitrary and tyrannical as Melville himself, and pay the minister back in his own coin.

The speech and bearing of Melville, as leader of the extreme Presbyterians, had its influence upon his followers, and bred many imitators. James frequently complained to the Church courts of the ministers' language, but got no redress. Their theory of spiritual independence, and their fondness of polemics in the pulpit, disposed them readily to exculpate the brethren charged with the use of intemperate language towards the king or the Court. In 1594, John Ross, a minister in Perth, had denounced the king before the provincial synod as a traitor, a reprobate, and a dissembling hypocrite. His language was reported to the Assembly, where Ross defended it, and his only

¹ Melville's *Diary*, pp. 369, 370.

² Buckle, *Hist. Civ.* iii. 110.

punishment was an admonition to be more cautious.¹ Ross was outstripped in vituperation by David Black, minister of St. Andrews, whom Tytler describes as "a fierce puritan." In a sermon, preached in October 1596, he denounced queen Elizabeth as an atheist, and the religion of her kingdom as an empty show, charged king James with manifest treachery, asserted that Satan was the head both of his Court and his Council, that all kings were the devil's bairns, that the lords of Session were miscreants and bribe-receivers, the nobility cormorants, and the queen of Scotland a woman whom, for fashion's sake, they might pray for, but in whose time it was vain to hope for good.²

The best defence for Black would be to say that he was a fanatic, and hardly responsible for his language. But this defence would not clear the permanent commission of the Kirk sitting in Edinburgh which warmly espoused his cause. Bowes, the English ambassador, remonstrated against the insult offered to his mistress. The maligning minister when brought before the Privy Council declined its judicature, and was supported by the standing committee of the Kirk which sent papers to every presbytery for signature in his defence. This action provoked a proclamation from the king, declaring their meetings illegal, and commanding them to leave the capital within twenty-four hours. They instantly convened, and, in the language of their own historian, "laid their letters open before the Lord." At first they meditated resistance, but more prudent counsels prevailed. The king was equally anxious to avoid a rupture, and sent for some of the ministers, pending the trial, to whom he

¹ *History of James Sext*, pp. 315, 324; *Book of Univ. Kirk*, pp. 409, 410.

² MS. State Paper Office, cited by Tytler, vii. 326.

said: "This licentious manner of treating of affairs of State in the pulpit cannot be tolerated. My claim is only to judge in matters of sedition and other civil and criminal causes, and of speeches that may import such crimes, wheresoever they may be uttered—in the pulpit or elsewhere; for surely if treason and sedition be crimes, much more are they so if committed in the pulpit where the Word of Truth alone should be taught and heard."¹ The king was reasonable, but Black remained obdurate. The Council found him guilty of language seditious and slanderous, and he was banished beyond the North Water.²

The troubles in Edinburgh did not end here. It was falsely reported that the returned marquis of Huntly had been closeted with the king, and the report set the Kirk in a blaze. The minister Balcanquhal next day attacked the Court in his sermon in St. Giles', and begged the lords and gentlemen present to meet in the little kirk (the chancel). A deputation waited on the king in the Tolbooth, and he was in no good humour at their interruption. "Who dares," he asked, "to convene contrary to my proclamation?" "Dares!" retorted lord Lindsay fiercely, "we dare more than that; and shall not suffer the truth to be overthrown, and stand tamely by." The result was a riot, during which James in terror retreated downstairs into the lower house where the judges were in session, and commanded the doors to be shut. The deputation returned to St. Giles' where they found a minister reading to an excited multitude the story of Haman and Mordecai. Shouts were raised to attack the doors of the Tolbooth, and bring out the wicked Haman; others cried out "The sword of the Lord and of

¹ Calderwood, v. 460, 468; Spotiswoode, ii. 423.

² The North Esk that divides Angus from Mearns.

Gideon," and a voice, louder than any exclaimed, "Armour, armour, save yourselves." The Tolbooth was attacked, but the provost appeared and with some difficulty appeased the angry mob.¹ Some hours afterwards the king, protected by the magistrates, slipped quietly down the streets to Holyrood. Next day the Court at an early hour removed to Linlithgow, and immediately after its departure a proclamation was read by a herald at the cross condemning the ministers for exciting the citizens to sedition, and threatening to remove at once the lords of session and every officer of justice from the town of Edinburgh, and so degrade it from its status as capital of the kingdom. The proclamation spread consternation among the craftsmen and burgesses of the city, who regarded it as the ruin of their interests. Robert Bruce, the minister, now no longer the king's favourite but his bitterest enemy, improved the occasion by haranguing the people upon "the manifest usurpation intended against Christ's kingdom."²

The experience of this riot impressed the king with an indelible sense of the fanaticism and disloyalty of the extreme Presbyterians. This impression was confirmed by one or two subsequent events. Welch, the minister, a son-in-law of John Knox, and imbued with the Reformer's teaching, described the king in a sermon as having been possessed with a devil, and told how this devil had gone out and seven worse spirits come in. He declared that it was lawful for his subjects to take the sword out of his hand; just as a father of a family, afflicted with insanity, might be seized and bound by his children. It was the same language and illustration, which Knox had used

¹ Burton (v. 311), calls this riot "the oldest specimen of a 'No Popery' mob."

² Spottiswoode, iii. 27-33; Calderwood, v. 366; Tytler, vii. 334-340.

to queen Mary. Spottiswoode calls it "a most execrable doctrine," but he says it was accepted by many of the preacher's hearers as "a sound and free application."¹

Of graver import than Welch's seditious sermon was a cabal of the ministers to induce lord Hamilton, the next heir to the throne after prince Henry, to become the leader of the disaffected ministers and nobles. They sent him a letter inviting him to meet them in Edinburgh for this object. Hamilton showed the letter to the king, who was justly incensed by this fresh incitement to rebellion. He ordered the ministers to be arrested, but they fled to Newcastle; he declared the late tumult in the capital to be treason, and held the magistrates responsible for it; he ordered the judicatories to be removed to Leith, and the Court of Session to Perth. The citizens in their alarm sent a deputation to James at Linlithgow, but his only answer was that he intended holding a meeting of the Estates "in the same place where the dishonour was done unto him, and would follow their advice both in the trial and punishment."²

So ended the year 1596, the year that Calderwood eulogises as the period of the Church's greatest perfection and beauty. "The Church of Scotland," he writes, "was now come to her perfection, and the greatest purity that she ever attained unto, both in doctrine and discipline, so that her beauty was admirable unto foreign Churches. The assemblies of the saints were never so glorious nor profitable to every one of the true members thereof, as in the beginning of this year."³ Calderwood's own pages show another side of the picture. A committee of the Assembly report "an universal coldness and decay of zeal in all estates, joined with ignorance, and contempt of the Word,

¹ *Hist.* iii. 34.

² Spottiswoode, iii. 34-36.

³ Calderwood, v. 387.

ministry, and sacraments, few religious exercises in the family, and the same profaned by cooks, stewards, jack-men, and such like ; superstition and idolatry, great blasphemy with horrible banning and cursing, profanation of the Sabbath by the exercise of wanton games, markets, dicing, drinking, whoredoms, bloodsheds, etc. ; and the country infested with gangs of idle persons having no lawful callings, as pipers, fiddlers, songsters, sorners, sturdy beggars, living in harlotry, and altogether contemning Word and sacraments.”¹

The reference in the same document to “the corruptions and enormities of the ministry and the remedy thereof,” points to little if any improvement on the clerical morals of the pre-Reformation period. “The too sudden admission and light trial of persons to the ministry” is made responsible for much of the evil. The discipline suggested by the Assembly’s committee recalls the futile efforts of Provincial Councils to reform the Roman priesthood ; and, as Burton remarks,² “it is not calculated to give an impression that the bulk of the clergy were either very high-minded or very pure.” It proposes that such ministers as are “light and wanton in their behaviour—as in gorgeous or light apparel, in speech, in using light and profane company, unlawful gaming, as dancing, carding, dicing, and such like, not beseeming the gravity of ane pastor—be sharply rebuked by the presbytery ; and if continuing therein after due admonition, that he be deprived as slanderous to the Gospel. That ministers being found swearers or banners, profaners of the Sabbath-day, drunkards, fighters, guilty of all these or any of them, be deposed *simpliciter* ; and such like liars, detractors, brawlers and quarrellers, after due admonition, as continue

¹ Calderwood, v. 387, 388. See also Row, pp. 172, 173.

² *History of Scotland*, v. 306.

therein, incur the same punishment. That ministers given to unlawful and incompetent trades for filthy gain,—as holding of hostelries, taking of usury, bearing worldly offices in noble and gentle-men's houses, merchandise and buying of victual and keeping it to dearth, etc., be admonished and brought to the acknowledgment of their faults; and if they continue therein, to be deposed."¹ Calderwood's ideal of "perfection and of greatest purity and beauty" may have existed in his own devout imagination; it certainly did not exist in the Church of Scotland in 1596.²

The king returned to Edinburgh on the 1st January 1597, and received a loyal welcome from the citizens, which somewhat atoned for the summer's disloyalty. Steps were at once taken for meetings of the Estates and of the Church, both to be held in Perth on the last day of February. Perth was chosen, as more central than Edinburgh, to allow the northern ministers to attend, and James evidently calculated upon their support in favour of the ecclesiastical polity he was now bent upon introducing. The two chief centres of ultra-Presbyterianism were the synod of Fife and the presbytery of Edinburgh. Its predominance in the former district is accounted for by the influence of the two Melvilles, and in the latter by the wise policy of the leaders in always selecting their strongest men for the capital. From the days of Knox, the Edinburgh pulpits had been filled by the ablest preachers and debaters in the Kirk; and as most of the Assemblies had been held in Edinburgh, or in other southland towns, they had hitherto taken their complexion very much from the Fife and Lothian leaders. There was equity as well as policy in James's selection of Perth,

¹ *Book of the Universal Kirk*, pp. 428, 429; Calderwood, v. 408-411.

² See Grub, ii. 269.

and the repeated accusations of kingcraft, and of an attempt to overpower the southern vote by the northern in this Perth Assembly, are not consistent in writers who are always advocating free and open debates, and the moral weight of majorities.¹

Prior to the meeting James had prepared and widely circulated a paper with fifty-five questions on the different subjects to be discussed. They included the external government of the Church, the election of pastors, with the relative rights of patrons and people, the principle of ordination, the privileges of the pulpit, the right of calling the Assembly, the question of excommunication, and the civil rights of the subject—whether these could be infringed by the ecclesiastical courts without power of the magistrate to interfere.²

Preparations were made on both sides for the battle at Perth. The synod of Fife met at St. Andrews, on 21st February, and answered the royal questions by anticipation. Sir Patrick Murray, as commissioner, was equally busy on the king's side among the northland ministers; and James Melville honoured him with the ironical title of "Apostle of the North." There was a geographical jealousy between north and south; and "the popes of Edinburgh," as the northern ministers called their brethren in the capital, were in little favour beyond the Tay.

When the meeting was convened the question was debated whether it was a lawful Assembly; and it was decided by the votes of eleven presbyteries to eight that it should be recognised as a special General Assembly—

¹ Burton, *Hist.* v. 313, says the choice of Perth "was a thoroughly wise measure; for no one could complain that the spot was partially

chosen, since no other considerable town is so unmistakably in the centre of Scotland."

² Spottiswoode, iii. 41-45.

the members from Fife dissenting and protesting. The king then laid before the Assembly for its consideration thirteen articles embodying the main points in his previous questions. After considerable discussion it was agreed—That his majesty should have power to introduce for debate in the Assembly any matter affecting the external government of the Church; that ministers should not meddle in the pulpit with affairs of State, nor attack persons by name in the pulpit; that each presbytery take diligent account of the doctrinal teaching of its ministers; that no more summary excommunications be permitted; that no session, presbytery, or synod censure people outside of their own bounds; that no conventions of ministers take place without the king's consent, except the ordinary sessions, presbyteries, and synods; that in the principal burghs no ministers be placed without the consent of the king and the congregation, and this order to take effect presently in Edinburgh. Commissioners were then appointed to receive Huntly and the other popish lords into the Church; and, lastly, an overture was made to the king for reconciliation with the citizens of Edinburgh touching last year's riot. James had not forgotten it, nor had he forgiven the ministers who, he now repeated, were the main cause of it; but having had so much of his own way in the Assembly, he was in royal good humour, and agreed that Robert Bruce and his friends should return to Edinburgh on their finding security for obedience to the law.¹

These resolutions were chiefly aimed at prevalent abuses introduced by the ministers, who were as autocratic in their public censures of king, lords, and commoners as if they had been the oldest hierarchy in Christendom.

¹ Calderwood, v. 606-622; Spottiswoode, iii. 48-55; *Book of Univ. Kirk*, pp. 439-449; Melville's *Diary*, pp. 403-410.

Their pulpit vituperations and summary excommunications had become an intolerable tyranny, destructive alike of the civil and of the religious liberty of the people.

The king was so highly pleased with the success of the Perth Assembly that he summoned another to meet in Dundee on the 10th May of the same year. Robert Rollock, first principal of the University which had been founded in Edinburgh in 1583, presided over it as moderator. He was a scholarly man, as modest as he was learned, but, unhappily for the Church and for learning, his life was short.¹ Huntly, Errol, and Angus were present in the Assembly to be purged of their offences against the reformed religion, and to be absolved from the censures of the Church. The Assembly at Perth was declared to be a lawful Assembly, and its proceedings were ratified; imposition of hands in the ordaining of ministers was decreed for all time coming, and a commission of ministers was appointed to consult with the king on all matters ecclesiastical.² This resolution, as well as some others, was stoutly opposed by the Melville section, who foresaw the use that might be made of it in moulding the Church's polity after the royal pattern; but they apparently could not see that the proposed commission was an exact copy of their own standing committee of which they had made such effective use in previous years. James was present at the ninth session, and made a speech—speechifying was his favourite pastime—which gave much satisfaction to the Assembly, for he promised them a minister for

¹ Rollock died in February 1599. For an account of him see Dalziel's *Hist. Univ. Ed.* ii. 30-39.

² The First Book of Discipline discarded the imposition of hands in ordination; the Second Book brought it back, but still the neglect of it must

have been common. It is a remarkable fact that Melville himself, the father of Presbyterianism, was never ordained, and that Bruce only submitted to it under the threat of deprivation. See Cunningham, i. 549.

every kirk, and a stipend for every minister. Amid the enthusiasm elicited by the royal speech the commission was appointed, comprising fourteen of the leading ministers, including James Melville, but excluding Andrew [who was altogether too impracticable for the king. Calderwood characterises the commission as "the king's led horse—a wedge taken out of the Church to rend her with her own forces, and the very needle which drew in the thread of bishops."] ¹

On the 26th June 1597, the two earls, Huntly and Errol, recanted their popish errors, and were received into the Protestant fold in the old church of St. Nicholas in Aberdeen.² Judging from the subsequent conduct of the earls, their action on this occasion must have been deeply hypocritical. "They made an open confession of their defection and apostasy, affirmed the religion presently confessed to be the only true religion, renounced all papistry, and swore never to decline again, but to defend the same to their life's end."³ The excommunications were recalled, the earls were feasted by the Aberdeen corporation, and their forfeiture was revoked by the Estates in the following November. But this was not an end of the business.

James was still bent upon completing his ecclesiastical polity. In the Parliament of November (1597) a significant Act was passed providing that any minister appointed by the king to the office of bishop or abbot should sit and vote in Parliament "as freely as any other ecclesiastical prelate had in any time bygone."⁴ There was opposition to the proposal from members of the prelatie order already in

¹ Calderwood, v. 644; Spottiswoode, iii. 58-60; *Book of Univ. Kirk*, pp. 450-463.

² Representations were made from the pope to the king about this

time in behalf of liberty of conscience. —Teulet, *Papiers*, etc. iii. 610.

³ *Analectica Scotica*, p. 300, cited by Burton, v. 295, 296.

⁴ *Acts Parl. Scot.* iv. 130.

possession of seats, but more serious opposition was offered in the Assembly held at Dundee in March 1598. Melville had denounced the proposal in the synod of Fife, and he crossed the Tay to oppose it in the Assembly. Here, for once, he was outmanœuvred. At a recent visitation of the University of St. Andrews, it had been agreed that its corporation should be represented by three members, and Melville was not one of the number. The king was present, and challenged his right to sit in the Assembly, and the great dictator had to withdraw. So "the slinger-out of bishops" was himself slung out of his favourite field,—the Assembly. His party was well represented by Bruce, Davidson, and James Melville, who argued on the one side against Buchanan, Gladstones, and Pont on the other. The king was always interposing and making his pragmatistical speeches—"I wish not," he said, "to bring in papistical or anglican bishops; but only to have the best and wisest of the ministry appointed by the General Assembly, to have place in Council and Parliament, to sit upon their own matters and see them done, and not to stand always at the door, like poor suppliants despised and nothing regarded." It was very plausible, but it did not deceive the opponents of the measure. Ferguson of Dunfermline, now one of the oldest ministers, compared the king's stratagem to the classical wooden horse which the Greeks imposed by craft upon the Trojans; and Davidson declared that they might "busk and busk the minister as bonnily as they could, and bring him in as fairly as they would; but we," he said, "see him weel eneuch—we see the horns of his mitre." In the end, it was settled by a majority of ten that fifty-one ministers, the same number as was returned from the old hierarchy, should have seats in Parliament. There was a historical nemesis in Dundee being the place where Episcopacy

was again ratified, seeing that in 1580 Episcopacy had met its overthrow in Dundee.¹

In the year 1600, at an Assembly in Montrose, the Church completed this parliamentary representation by agreeing to provide the king with a leet of six ministers from which he was to choose one for each vacancy as it occurred. Various "caveats" or restrictions were framed to prevent any abuse of the representatives' powers. They were to act in Parliament according to the directions of the Assembly, to be subject like other ministers to its authority, to devolve their commission annually to the Assembly, and they were not to be called bishops, a name still of evil omen, but commissioners. "And thus," says Calderwood, "the Trojan horse, the Episcopacy, was brought in busked and covered with *caveats*, that the danger and deformity might not be seen; which, notwithstanding, was seen of many and opposed unto."²

James had now his triumph over Melville, and he thought to win another over Bruce. When the minister was in high favour at Court the king had given him a rich pension for life from the abbacy of Arbroath. He now sought to recall it, and when sued by Bruce in the Court of Session he attempted to browbeat the court, for which he was severely reprimanded by the lord president Seton. The decision was in Bruce's favour; and a contemporary letter says that "the mortified monarch thereupon flung out of court, muttering revenge, and raging marvellously."³

For some years the king had been dabbling in literature of various kinds, including poesy and demonology. In 1598 he produced his *Law of Free Monarchies*,

¹ Calderwood, v. 668-670, 680-696; Spottiswoode, iii. 67-69; Melville's *Diary*, pp. 436, 437.

² Calderwood, vi. 1-26; Spottis-

woode, iii. 82; *Book of Univ. Kirk*, pp. 477-490.

³ MS. letter cited by Tytler, vii. 377.

which was regarded as a bid for the English throne; and next year it was followed by a more ambitious work *Basilikon Doron*, in the shape of instructions to his son, prince Henry.¹ Only a few copies in MS. were circulated privately among friends, and one of them surreptitiously came into Melville's hands. It was brought before the synod of Fife as an anonymous work that the author might be more freely handled as a defamer of the Kirk. "The synod judged them (the writings) treasonable, seditious, and wicked, thinking that such things should not be, and directed them to the king."² There were grounds for the synod's displeasure, all the more that much of the king's criticism was true. He describes the ministers as "fiery and seditious spirits who delighted to rule as *Tribuni Plebis*"; accuses them of having been the wreck of two queens, and of having placed themselves during a long minority at the head of every faction which had weakened and distracted the country. He warns prince Henry against both them and their fanaticism—"Take heed, therefore, my son, to such puritans, very pests in the Church and Commonweal, whom no deserts can oblige, neither oaths nor promises bind; breathing nothing but sedition and calumnies, aspiring without measure, railing without reason; and making their own imaginations (without any warrant of the Word) the square of their conscience. I protest before the great God—and since I am here as upon my testimony, it is no place for me to lie in—that ye shall never find with any Highland or border thieves greater ingratitude and more lies, and vile perjuries, than with these fanatic spirits."³ The action taken by the synod of Fife obliged the king to publish the book soon afterwards. It was well received in Eng-

¹ Teulet, *Papiers*, etc. iii. 613, 614.

² Melville's *Diary*, p. 444.

³ *Basilikon Doron*, book ii. p. 160.

land, and its people looked forward hopefully to the advent of so learned a monarch to their throne. In Scotland its publication was followed by a rigorous fast of two days which the Kirk imposed on the people for the backslidings of their king.¹

A company of English comedians under Fletcher and Martin next set the king and Kirk at variance. Fletcher had been in Scotland in 1594, and James, who was a lover of the drama, invited his return in 1599. The ministers at once took alarm, and condemned the mummeries of the stage as only less detestable than the mass itself. The magistrates, acting at the dictation of the ministers, had prohibited the inhabitants by proclamation from visiting the theatre. But James was not to be baffled by magistrate or minister. He summoned the provost and councillors, and compelled them to recall their proclamation by sound of trumpet; he summoned the four kirk sessions and insisted that the ministers should, next Sunday, announce from the pulpit that the king's subjects were to be open to no censure by visiting the theatre, "seeing that," as the royal edict ran, "we are not of purpose or intention to authorise anything which is profane or may carry any offence."²

The Gowrie conspiracy fills a painful page in Scottish history. The young earl of Gowrie returned to Scotland in May 1600 from the Continent where he had lived for some years, spending the last three months with Beza at Geneva. On his return through England he visited the Court of Elizabeth, and had frequent confidential interviews with her Majesty, which are supposed to have influenced his after conduct. The earl's younger brother, Alexander

¹ Spottiswoode, iii. 80, 81; Tytler, vii. 381-383.

² Tytler, vii. 386, 387; Spottiswoode, iii. 81. It has been con-

jectured that Shakespeare was a member of this dramatic company, but the belief rests on no sufficient grounds.

Ruthven, on Tuesday, 5th August, decoyed king James from Falkland to his brother's house in Perth, under the pretence that he wished the king to examine a man of suspicious character, whom he professed to have discovered the night before, having under his cloak a pot filled with valuable foreign gold. James went, with whatever motive he may be credited; but instead of a man with gold he found awaiting him a man in armour. Young Ruthven followed the king into the room and threatened his life in revenge for his own father's death. James called for help from the window, and in the scuffle which ensued both Ruthven and his brother, the earl, were fatally stabbed.¹ Perhaps the worst part of the king's conduct in the business was the vindictive spirit in which he threatened the younger and innocent members of the Gowrie family, who happily saved themselves by flight to Berwick. It is now generally believed that the object of Gowrie was not to murder but to kidnap the king, as his father had done, and administer the kingdom in his name with the aid of Elizabeth. James, in gratitude for his escape, changed the weekly preachings in Edinburgh from Friday to Tuesday, and marked the 5th of August in his calendar as a festival. Gowrie was an ardent Protestant, and had brought with him from the Continent glowing commendations of his orthodoxy, a fact which weighed with the Edinburgh ministers in discrediting the king's version of the conspiracy. His attempts to convince them make amusing reading. The ministers remained sceptical, and the once favourite Bruce paid for his obduracy by being again banished from the capital—this time to France.²

¹ Teulet, *R. P.* iv. 229.

² Teulet, *Papiers*, etc. iii. 618-623; Spottiswoode, iii. 84-91; *Book of Univ. Kirk*, p. 526; Burton, v.

316-352; Tytler, vii. 391-431. Bruce returned, and had an interview with the king at Holyrood on the morning of his start for London, 1603.

James never slackened his hand in pushing forward the restoration of Episcopacy. The three sees of Ross, Aberdeen, and Caithness, were filled in 1600 by bishops, still titular. David Lindsay, minister of Leith, was appointed to Ross, and made no protestations now against Episcopacy. Lindsay had ministered at Leith since the Reformation, and the diocese of Ross probably saw little of his presence. He had the honour of baptizing at Holyrood the king's third child, "baby Charles," who was born on the 19th November 1600 at Dunfermline. It was reckoned a bad omen that the little prince was too delicate in health to accompany the royal family to England in 1603.

The last Assembly at which James was present was held in May 1601 at Burntisland. The moderator, Hall, addressed the Assembly upon the general defection from the purity and practice of true religion, which he said was so great that it must of necessity conclude either in popery or atheism, unless a substantial and timely remedy were provided. The evils were then described, and the last two Sundays in June appointed as days of humiliation and fasting. After filling the vacancies in the Edinburgh ministry, the Assembly entered upon a new field—the revision of the Church's sacred books. James suggested a new translation of the Bible and the revision of the "Psalm-Book"—Knox's Liturgy—and surprised as much as he delighted the ministers by a speech which showed no mean acquaintance with the subject. A committee was appointed, and Pont was made preses, but nothing came of the proposal. In a few years the king was in England, and from the divines of that country came the "Authorised Version" of the Bible. The fate of Knox's and of other liturgies in Scotland remains to be told.¹

¹ Spottiswoode, iii. 96-99; *Book of Univ. Kirk*, pp. 497, 498.

Before the close of the century many of the actors on both sides of the Reformation struggle had passed away. Adam Bothwell, bishop of Orkney, died in 1593; William Chisholm, bishop of Dunblane, in 1594; and a better man than either, John Leslie, bishop of Ross, the faithful friend of queen Mary, died at Brussels in 1596; David Ferguson, minister of Dunfermline, in 1598; and Principal Rollock, of Edinburgh, in the prime of life, in 1599. John Craig, once Knox's colleague, who began clerical life as a Dominican friar, died in 1600; and John Durie, Melville's faithful supporter, whose early years were spent as a Benedictine monk in Dunfermline, died in the same year. The last Roman archbishop of Glasgow, James Beaton, died in Paris on the 24th April 1603, while king James was on his way to the English throne. Beaton was a munificent benefactor of the Scots College, Paris, founded by an earlier Scottish bishop; and to the college he bequeathed the chartularies of his diocese, which he took with him on his flight from Glasgow in 1560.¹

Queen Elizabeth died 24th March 1603, and on the 5th April James began his journey to London. On the Sunday preceding he attended service at St. Giles' church, and after sermon addressed the congregation in his characteristic way. He assured them that his inheritance of the throne of England would not diminish his love for the Scottish people. "There is no more difference," he said, "betwixt London and Edinburgh than betwixt Inverness or Aberdeen and Edinburgh; for all our marches are dry, and there be ferries betwixt them. But my course must be to establish peace, and religion,

¹ The Glasgow Chartulary has been edited by Cosmo Innes. See also Father Thomas Innes, *Crit. Essay*, pp. 579, 580; Spottiswoode, iii. 139, 140; Mackenzie's *Lives*, iii. 466.

and wealth betwixt both countries; and as God has joined the right of both kingdoms in my person, so may you be joined in wealth, in religion, in heart, and affections." He made a promise to revisit Scotland every three years at the least, which, like many other royal promises, was not kept.¹ James and his consort were crowned in Westminster Abbey on 25th July, and the Scottish royal line was thus enthroned on the fated stool of destiny, the Liafail, stolen by Edward I. from Scone. The union which that monarch had striven to accomplish by war and conquest was brought about peaceably, and Scotland and England, much to the satisfaction and the advantage of both nations, became united under one king, though not as yet into one kingdom.

¹ Calderwood, vi. 216.

CHAPTER IX

JAMES VI.—FROM HIS ACCESSION TO THE ENGLISH THRONE 1603 TO THE RESTORATION OF THE EPISCOPAL SUCCESSION IN SCOTLAND 1610

English puritans' "Millenary Petition"—Conference at Hampton Court—More titular bishops, Spottiswoode for Glasgow—Disputed Assembly at Aberdeen—Imprisonment of ministers—Parliament at Perth repeals Annexation Act—Prelatic pride in Perth—King sends for titular bishops and Presbyterian ministers—Andrew Melville's behaviour—Melville at Whitehall—Tyranny of king to Melville and his friends—Melville's imprisonment in the Tower and exile in Sedan—Banishment of six ministers—Assembly at Linlithgow 1606—Parliament orders Chapter for St. Andrews—Persecution of Romanists—Consistorial Courts and two courts of High Commission restored—Decline of Presbyterianism—Gradation of Church courts—Episcopacy restored by Glasgow Assembly of 1610—Eleven Articles accepted—Imprisonment of Huntly, Angus, and Errol as papists—Spottiswoode, Lamb, and Hamilton in London—King's object to have them consecrated—Their consecration in London.

THE English puritans met king James on his way to London and presented him with the "Millenary Petition." The petitioners professed to be "groaning under a burden of human rites and ceremonies," such as the cap and surplice, the sign of the cross in baptism, the use of the ring in marriage, and the ordinance of confirmation. As James was coming from a country where Presbyterianism had been lately established, they fully expected him to deliver them from these "burdens," and probably to relieve them also of the Anglican hierarchy and liturgy.

Row narrates the steps that were taken in Scotland by anticipation "for the effectuating of that good purpose of reducing England to Presbyterian government."¹

With the object of conciliating the puritans a conference was held at Hampton Court, on the 14th January 1604. It gave James an opportunity, in which he greatly delighted, of displaying his classical scholarship and his Scottish theology among learned divines who would not, as he said, brave him like the overbearing ministers in the Assembly. In the conference nine bishops, seven deans, and one archdeacon represented the Anglican Church, and four ministers appeared for the puritans. The session lasted three days, and, on the first, the king made an oration in marked contrast to that which is said to have evoked the fervid applause and prayer of the northern Assembly. He said "that he was now come into the promised land; that he sat among grave and reverend men, and was not a king, as formerly, without state, nor in a place where beardless boys would brave him to his face." That was true, but the difference was by no means to the credit of the English bishops, who comported themselves towards the king with a servile adulation which argued a want of manliness or of sincerity.²

On the second day the puritans were admitted, and Patrick Galloway, minister of Perth, one of the Scottish leaders, was also present to watch the proceedings in the interests of the northern Church. Dr. Reynolds of Cambridge, a learned puritan, stated the case against the Anglican ceremonies, and the king answered that he would not argue with him as to things indifferent, as they were part of his royal prerogative. "I will have

¹ *History of the Kirk*, pp. 220-221.

² Neal's *Hist. of Puritans*, i. 410-414.

one doctrine," he said, "one discipline, one religion, in substance and ceremony; therefore never speak more to that point, how far you are bound to obey." On their demand for periodical meetings, "his majesty was somewhat stirred, thinking that they aimed at a Scottish presbytery, 'which,' saith he, 'as well agreeth with monarchy as God and the devil; then Jack and Tom, Will and Dick shall meet, and at their pleasure censure both me and my Council. I remember how they used the poor lady my mother in Scotland, and me in my minority.'" Then, turning to the bishops, and touching his hat, he added: "My lords, I may thank you that these puritans plead for my supremacy, for if once you are out and they in place, I know what would become of my supremacy; for *no bishop, no king*."¹

The third day was occupied in conference chiefly with the Anglican prelates, and so gratified were they with the wisdom of the Scottish Solomon, that Whitgift, the aged primate of Canterbury, professed to the king: "Your majesty undoubtedly speaks by the special assistance of God's Spirit." James was evidently of the same opinion, judging from a boastful letter he sent to Scotland, magnifying his polemical victory. "They fled me so," he wrote, "from argument to argument, without ever answering me directly, that I was forced to tell them that if any of them when boys had disputed thus in the college, the moderator would have fetched them up, and applied the rod to their buttocks." The Scottish Presbyterians were much interested in the results of the conference, and when Galloway sent his written report, revised by the king, to the presbytery of Edinburgh, their worst fears were confirmed. James Melville was present at their meeting, and exhorted them that, "as the presbytery of

¹ Neal's *Hist. Puritans*, i. 414-417.

Edinburgh had ever been as the Sion and watch-tower of their Kirk, and the ministers thereof the chief watchmen, so it behoved them to watch that no peril or contagion came from their neighbour Kirk."¹

In the Convocation of Canterbury, which met in March following, it was provided by canon that prayers should be offered in all congregations "for Christ's Holy Catholic Church, and especially for the Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland." It has been disputed whether this was intended for the Scottish Church as it then was, or for the Church as it was about to become. Something might be said for both views, if the subject were worth discussion. Presbytery nominally held the field as by law established; but the titular bishops were still in evidence, and it was now an open secret that the king meant to establish Episcopacy.²

One result of the Hampton Court conference deserves to be recalled with gratitude by all the English-speaking race. It was here that the scheme was projected for a new translation of the Bible, which was issued in the year 1611, and came to be known as the Authorised Version. Since then it has been the recognised standard not only of religion but of the English language. James has to be credited with the initiative of this good work, for "his majesty wished that some special pains should be taken in that behalf for one uniform translation, professing that he had never yet seen a Bible well translated into English."³

Several appointments were made about this time of titular bishops to vacant Scottish sees. On the death of

¹ Cardwell, *History of Conference*, pp. 185, and 212-217; Neal, i. 417-419; Calderwood, vi. 241-247.

² The canons framed in this Convocation, 6-9, declare that those who reject the Episcopal form of government are to be excommuni-

cate. See Chancellor Harrington's pamphlets on the Bidding Prayer and Brief Notes on the Church of Scotland; also his *Reformers of the Anglican Church*, p. 11.

³ See Burton, v. 430, 431.

Beaton, described as "late lawful archbishop of Glasgow," John Spottiswoode, the historian, minister of Calder, and son of the superintendent of Lothian, was nominated by the king to the see. In the same year, 1604, Gladstones was translated from Caithness to the metropolitan see of St. Andrews. Both men became prominent agents and co-operators with the king in the restoration of the Episcopal succession; and Spottiswoode's learning and loyalty gave him special influence for many years in the affairs of both Church and State, though his conduct, as we shall see, was not always blameless.

Attention was at this time drawn to the disputed Assembly of Aberdeen. Burton never wearies in reminding his readers that the General Assembly was "a novelty recently brought from France." All the same, it was an importation which took a vigorous hold of the Scottish mind. It is not every exotic that has thriven as this has done in the soil of the hardy thistle. The Assemblies begin now, however, to lose much of their importance and nearly all their vivacity from the absence of the disputatious monarch, although they still gave occasion for strife between kirk and king. The Assembly was cited to meet in Aberdeen in July 1604, and was prorogued for a year by royal proclamation. James Melville and other eight ministers met in St. Nicholas' church of that city to protest and remonstrate. Next July the Assembly was again prohibited by the king's command, and once more the protesters, to the number of nineteen, appeared and elected John Forbes, minister of Alford, as their moderator. A messenger, bearing a letter from the lords of the Secret Council, compelled them to dissolve.¹ They did so under protest, adjourning the Assembly to September. The result of the collision between Kirk and

¹ Secret Council is but another name for Privy Council.

Crown was that several of the ministers were warded in Blackness. Forbes, the moderator, and John Welch, Knox's son-in-law, with other four brethren were summoned before the Secret Council, and upon their declining its jurisdiction, were tried for treason in January 1606. The decision was not given until October, when they were found guilty by nine out of fifteen jurymen of contempt of court, and sentenced to be banished from the king's dominions for life.¹

There is no denying the tyranny of the king's prosecution of the ministers ; but whether it was "punishment or persecution" depends, as Burton remarks, "upon the question whether the control of the ecclesiastical assemblies of an Established Church belongs to the Crown or to the Church itself."² The Act of 1592 assigned to the Church the power of appointing the Assembly's meetings, failing the king's appointment ; but the special General Assembly of Perth, 1597, limited the recognised meetings of the Church to sessions, presbyteries, and synods, expressly omitting the Assembly, and implying that it could only be convoked by royal warrant. "This question, oddly enough," adds Burton, "is not yet settled, and it is evaded by a subterfuge so abundantly ridiculous as to be a standing butt for the jests of the profane."³

On the 9th July 1606 a Parliament was held at Perth, the earl of Montrose being the king's commissioner. The Act of 1587, which annexed the estates of the bishops to the Crown, was rescinded ; but confirmation was given to the grants which had been made of other prelaties and benefices. The king's prerogative was also affirmed to a

¹ Calderwood, vi. 342-391 ; Spottiswoode, iii. 161-163 ; Melville's *Diary*, pp. 593-612. For Welch see his controversy with Gilbert Brown, abbot of New Abbey.—*Select Biographies*, Wodrow Society, i. 7, 51-53.

² *Hist.* v. 436.

³ Burton, v. 433. The Assembly is convened and dissolved both by the commissioner in the name of the State and by the moderator in the name of the Church.

degree which made him sovereign over all persons and in all causes ; and the temporal lordship of the bishops was set up without any caveats, in accordance with a letter from the king, expressing his desire to maintain the ancient constitution of the Three Estates.¹

There was much display of prelatic pomp in the Perth Parliament. The nobles were accustomed to ride in their robes to the place of meeting. Ten titular archbishops and bishops, clad in silk and velvet, rode through the streets of Perth between the earls and lords. One modest man, Blackburn, titular-bishop of Aberdeen, had no relish for the episcopal cavalcade, and went to the Parliament-house on foot. But David Lindsay, minister of Leith, the once vigorous protester against episcopacy, was in the mounted procession as bishop of Ross. John Knox, who, on a similar occasion had exclaimed against "the stinking pride of women," would have had better cause now to exclaim against the stinking pride of prelates. They were not satisfied with their position in the order of march, but claimed to rank before the earls, next to marquises ; and because this precedence was denied them, they afterwards withdrew from the processions. Men of this stamp were not likely to prove strong pillars in a restored episcopacy, or to reconcile disaffected Scots to its ancient rule. Scotland had seen enough of the mediæval lord-bishop, and what the country wanted in the seventeenth century was the revival of the apostolic spirit, the humility, the simplicity, the holy zeal of the first bishops that gathered the native tribes under the banner of the cross. The prelatic parade in the streets of Perth was a bad omen for the episcopacy that was to restore Apostolic Order.

In the autumn of the year James sent for the two

¹ Calderwood, vi. 493, 494.

titular archbishops, the bishops of Orkney and Galloway, and Nicolson, minister at Meigle, bishop-designate of Dunkeld, and also for the two Melvilles and other six ministers to confer with him at Hampton Court on the ecclesiastical affairs of Scotland. On successive days in September they were invited to the king's chapel to hear sermons by Anglican divines upon the rights of episcopacy, the claims of the royal prerogative, and the unscriptural character of lay elders. This was varied by conferences with the king, in which he questioned them upon the lawfulness of what he called the conventicle at Aberdeen and the imprisonment of the six ministers for treason. The Scottish bishops condemned the meeting as unlawful, while Andrew Melville and his friends justified it, and defended the conduct of the ministers. Turning upon the lord advocate who was present, Melville accused him of having persecuted the ministers in Scotland; "and still my lord," he said, "you show yourself possessed of the same spirit, for, not content with having pleaded against them in Scotland, you still continue to be 'the accuser of the brethren'" —quoting the last words in Greek. Some one asked what Melville had called the Advocate, and the king answered, "he called him 'the meikle deevil.'"

The course of controversial theology was continued by another service and sermon on St. Michael's Day. Melville had time to survey the furnishings of the royal chapel, and wrote a sarcastic Latin epigram upon what he saw, which somehow fell into the king's hands. It was more than James could stand to have his religion lampooned by a subject in Latin verse. Melville was not in Falkland Palace but in Hampton Court, and "the silly vassal," whose sleeves he had once plucked, was now a great monarch, and could be, on provocation, as tyrannical as the minister himself. Melville must pay for his

audacity. He was cited before the Court at Whitehall to answer for his misdemeanour. When Bancroft, now archbishop of Canterbury, declared the offence to amount to treason, Melville unceremoniously interrupted him—"My lord," said he, "Andrew Melville was never a traitor; but there was one Richard Bancroft who, during the life of the late queen, wrote a treatise against his majesty's title to the crown, and here is the book"—pulling it from his pocket as he spoke. By this time Melville had approached the primate, and, seizing the sleeves of his rochet, he shook them roughly and called them Romish rags. "If you," he said, still addressing the primate, "are the author of the book called *English Scotticizing*, I regard you as the capital enemy of all the reformed Churches in Europe, and as such I will profess myself an enemy to you and to your proceedings to the effusion of the last drop of my blood." The lord chancellor then took Melville in hand and admonished him to add modesty and discretion to his learning and years. The end of the business was that Melville was committed to the custody of the dean of St. Paul's, and afterwards sent to the Tower, where he was kept a prisoner for three or four years. On regaining his liberty he accepted the office of professor of divinity in the Huguenot University at Sedan. There he lived in comparative obscurity, broken in health and spirits, a victim of the gout, which kept him bed-fast for some years before his death in 1622.¹

Neither Scotland nor the Kirk was the same after the banishment of Andrew Melville. He was a truly remarkable man; in some respects a great man—great in his unrivalled scholarship, great in his force of character and fearless courage. A republican in principle both for

¹ Spottiswoode, iii. 177-183; Calderwood, vi. 559-589; Melville's *Diary*, pp. 688-711.

Church and State, the establishment of the Presbyterian polity in Scotland is due to his genius. The credit of its introduction is often erroneously ascribed to John Knox who was dead and buried twenty years before Presbytery was developed in Scotland.

The behaviour of King James to the Scottish ministers whom he had invited to England was, besides being supremely foolish and tyrannical, a gross breach of the law of hospitality which of itself should have protected them. The other ministers were allowed to return to Scotland in May 1607, excepting James Melville, once in high favour with the king, who retired to Newcastle, and later to Berwick where he died. He was a bland and kindly man, of a different temperament from his imperious uncle, but so completely under his influence that he followed him in all his devious ways, and became the apologist in his *Diary* of his most indefensible actions. We owe to his *Diary* the best contemporary picture of the birth-throes and early struggles of Presbytery in Scotland.¹

Forbes and Welch and the other four ministers, condemned in October for what were declared to be the treasonable meetings in Aberdeen, were banished in November. The leave-taking at the pier of Leith in the early morning makes a touching picture in the historic landscape of that age, when Welch led the prayers, and a vast body of sympathisers raised their voices in the twenty-third psalm to the Lord their Shepherd. The ministers bade Scotland farewell for a time, and the people returned to their homes the more confirmed in their Presbyterianism from the suffering of their ministers. Several other preachers were relegated to districts then supposed to be outlandish—Caithness, Orkney, Lewis, and Cantyre.²

¹ Row, pp. 237, 238.

² Calderwood, vi. 590-591; Spottiswoode, iii. 181-182.

The Assembly met at Linlithgow on the 10th December 1606. The earl of Dunbar was king's commissioner and James Nicolson, afterwards bishop of Dunkeld, was elected moderator. There were present a hundred and thirty-six ministers, and thirty-three nobles and burghers—a fairly representative body, although it has been disparaged as a caucus meeting. There was the usual zeal for the suppression of popery; and the better to effect this object and to strengthen the powers of the presbyteries, it was agreed to appoint the most experienced ministers in each presbytery as permanent moderators of the same. This is a policy often advocated by Presbyterians of the present day, but their historians condemn the action at Linlithgow as an insidious device of the enemy to cover the introduction of Episcopacy, probably because the bishops were to act as moderators of the presbyteries in which they resided, and also of their diocesan synods. The sum of 100 pounds Scots was assigned by James to the fixed moderator in each presbytery, an arrangement which requires to be noted, as the distribution of this money at the Assembly of Glasgow which established Episcopacy in 1610, has been represented as an act of bribery. There was opposition in some of the provincial synods to the statutes of the Linlithgow Assembly, and the synod of Fife and the presbyteries of Lothian and the Merse, the strongholds of Presbyterianism, led the opposition and refused to elect constant moderators.¹

An Act was passed in the Parliament held at Edinburgh, in August 1607, authorising the archbishop of St. Andrews to select seven ministers within his diocese to form a chapter in place of the prior and canons of the

¹ Calderwood, vi. 601-627; Spottiswoode, iii. 183-187; Row, pp. 240-245; *Book of Univ. Kirk*, pp. 567-574.

old hierarchy. This was reasonable enough, but the Act came from the wrong quarter—the Parliament of the State, instead of the Parliament of the Church, which was never consulted. The same high-handed action vitiated much of the king's policy, now firmly resolved upon, to establish Episcopacy in Scotland. It is a proof, which is confirmed from other sources, that the nobles and burgesses, comprising with the prelates the Three Estates of the realm, were, if not favourable, certainly not opposed to Episcopacy; but it would have been only constitutional to have consulted the Assembly as the supreme court of the Church.

Another meeting of Assembly was held again in Linlithgow on the 26th July 1608, the bishop of Orkney being elected moderator by a majority of votes. Besides the earl of Dunbar, royal commissioner, there were present above forty noblemen who took part in the proceedings. Some of the ministers challenged their right to do so, a right which had never been disputed for the fifty years preceding, in course of which the reforming lords, for reasons already indicated, had been prominent actors in many Assemblies. The opposition to their presence now was an admission that the nobles were hostile to the policy of the high Presbyterians of Melville's school, and in favour of a return to the episcopal form of Church government. Patrick Galloway, the retiring moderator, answered the objecting ministers "that if they would cast off the noblemen, their conclusions would want execution; for we must pray and preach," said he, "but they must fight,"—a rather belligerent argument from a Church moderator.

The relapse of the marquis of Huntly and the earls of Angus and Errol into popery, which had come up for consideration in the previous Assembly, was again

discussed in this. There was no abatement of the odious persecution of the Roman Catholics. Episcopalians and Presbyterians were equally imbued with the fierce fanaticism of the time, which imprisoned good men and confiscated their properties for no other crime than being faithful to their religion. Huntly was again excommunicated by the Assembly, and presbyteries were enjoined to deal with other papist lords and lairds, while the commissioner declared from his seat that after forty days no mercy should be shown to them. Ministers were also ordered to safeguard the young against popery by catechising children above six years of age in the creed, the Lord's prayer, and the ten commandments. After this exhibition of their charity the Assembly was closed with prayer and the singing of Psalms—"And how becoming well, together such as brethren are, in unity to dwell."¹

The Parliament of 24th June 1609, passed fresh penal laws against the much-suffering papists, and at the same time restored to the bishops the old jurisdiction of the consistorial courts which made them judges in all matters affecting marriage and divorce, and in any business comprised under the elastic words "spiritual and ecclesiastical." In the same Parliament James received statutory authority to regulate the robes of ecclesiastics, judges, and magistrates. This has been facetiously described as "constituting this famous monarch by act of Parliament tailor to the Court of Session and the Church."²

In February of next year the king enlarged the legal jurisdiction of the Church by the erection of two courts of High Commission, one in each of the provinces, St. Andrews and Glasgow, for the trial of such as were "scandalous in life or religion." A sederunt of the court

¹ Calderwood, vi. 751-778; Spottiswoode, iii. 193-195; *Book of Univ. Kirk*, pp. 575-587; Row, pp. 249-252. ² Cunningham, ii. 21.

required not less than five commissioners, of whom the archbishop must be one, and the others, bishops, lords, judges, and ministers. They had power to fine, imprison, or excommunicate a subject, and they might depose a minister, but not apparently without appeal. These courts have been identified with the courts of the same name established by Henry VIII. in England, which were made instruments of oppression by both Tudor and Stuart sovereigns. But the Scottish courts of High Commission resembled the English in name more than in reality. The same powers as to fines and imprisonment are now committed to single judges and magistrates, without the guarantee afforded by a necessary quorum of five members, and there is no clamour raised against the arbitrary powers of the bench. It was the high-handed way in which the courts were set up, by royal prerogative and without consent of Parliament, which made them unpopular and odious. Dr. Burton, as a Scottish lawyer, takes a very different view of the courts from that of the ecclesiastical historians who have expatiated upon their tyranny and oppression.¹

Presbyterianism had been slowly and steadily declining for some time. In four years, 1592-96, it had reached its zenith; and then from various causes, not the least being the extravagant assumptions of Melville and his supporters, it entered upon its declension. Presbyteries, synods, and assemblies remained, but they were now what Calderwood regretfully calls "shadows and shows of our discipline." They still continued under Episcopacy as under Presbyterianism, the bishop presiding in the synod and the archbishop in the Assembly. There

¹ *Hist. Scot.* v. 442. Their decisions were subject to an appeal to the Court of Session. Burton in a note cites a case of appeal by the Aberdeen papists against a decret of

archbishop Spottiswoode. See also Calderwood, vii. 57-63; Melville's *Diary*, pp. 786-792; Cook's *Hist. Ch. Scot.* ii. 249.

is nothing incompatible with a free and constitutional Episcopacy in graded ecclesiastical courts, from the little circle of the kirk-session to the supreme sphere of the Assembly. Scottish Presbyterians borrowed the system from the French Huguenots, but the idea was no invention of Frenchmen. If not as old as the hills, it is at least as old as civilisation, whether applied to civil or ecclesiastical government. The Anglo-Saxon tithings and hundreds, leading up to the Witenagemot, represented the same principle of gradation, and it was also exemplified both under the Greek and Roman Republics in pre-Christian times. The idea of such subdivision of government admits of no patent. Its simplicity and practical efficiency have been its obvious recommendation alike to statesmen and to ecclesiastics. Our modern parish councils, county councils, etc. are only developments of the same universal norm; or, in other words, of the principle of a series of judicatories, each invested with governing power proportionate to the area in which it exercises authority.

Everything was now in readiness for the restoration in Scotland of the ancient historic Episcopate, but it was not deemed wise that the restoration should be effected by an arbitrary proclamation from Whitehall. The royal prerogative had already been stretched to the verge of snapping, and James wisely agreed, acting, as Spottiswoode says, under the advice of the titular bishops, to summon a General Assembly for the adoption of Episcopal government. The king's action was, however, greatly vitiated by his interference, through the archbishop of St. Andrews, in the choice of ministers to represent the different presbyteries in the Assembly.¹

The Assembly met in Glasgow on the 8th June 1610

¹ Calderwood, vii. 91-93.

under the earl of Dunbar, who was again royal commissioner, and there were present thirteen bishops, as many nobles, forty barons and burghers, and upwards of a hundred ministers. Spottiswoode, titular archbishop of Glasgow, was chosen moderator; and in his sermon before the Assembly he severely denounced the sacrilege that had occurred, the unfaithfulness among lay patrons, and the ecclesiastical strife that had prevailed. Religion, he said, had been brought in by confusion, it must now be maintained by order; it had been brought in against authority, it must now be maintained by authority. The bishop of Orkney, and Dr. Hudson, an English divine, also preached; the one, on the lawfulness of episcopacy, and the other, on the superiority of bishops over presbyters.

The first day of meeting was observed as a fast; and Calderwood, who never misses an apposite illustration when it tells for his own side, compares it to the fast that was proclaimed when Naboth's vineyard was taken from him by royal prerogative. Much of the business was practically settled in committee, and although the same thing was invariably done in the Scottish Parliament by the lords of the Articles, this fact has been made a pretext for branding the Assembly as a gagged conventicle. There was more order and decorum than sometimes prevailed in Assemblies, due to the absence of the fiery leaders, now exiled by tyranny, and also to the manner in which ministers had been elected.

After three days' discussion the following eleven articles were accepted with little opposition. (1) That the calling of General Assemblies belongs to the king, and that the conventicle of Aberdeen in 1605 was unlawful. (2) That Diocesan Synods be held twice in the year, April and October, or oftener in the larger dioceses, for

convenience of the ministry, and that the bishops be their moderators. (3) That no sentence of excommunication, or absolution therefrom, be pronounced without the approbation of the bishop, and that if he stay the pronouncing of any legitimate sentence he shall be tried by the Assembly, and if convicted, intimation shall be made to the king for his removal. (4) That all presentations to benefices be made to the bishop of the diocese, who shall, after trial and examination of the presentee, perfect his ordination with the assistance of the ministers of the bounds. (5) That in the suspension and deposition of ministers the bishop should associate with himself the ministers of the bounds wherein the delinquent served, and upon trial and conviction pronounce sentence. (6) That every minister on his admission swear obedience to his majesty and the Ordinary according to the form appointed in 1572. (7) That the bishops visit their dioceses in person, or by deputy where the diocese is too large. (8) That the weekly exercise of doctrine among the ministers be continued, and that the bishop moderate the same, or appoint a substitute in synod.¹ (9) That the bishops be subject in all things concerning their life, conversation, office, and benefice, to the censure of the General Assembly, and, being found culpable, with his majesty's consent be deprived. (10) That no bishop be elected until the completion of his fortieth year, and after ten years' service as a teaching minister. (11) That no minister speak against these articles in public, nor dispute the question of the equality or inequality of the ministry, as tending only to schism and dispeace.²

¹ The weekly exercise existed before the institution of presbyteries; it here takes the place of the presbytery, a name which is now dropped.

² Calderwood, vii. 91-108; Spottiswoode, iii. 205-207; Row's *History*,

pp. 274-279; *Book of Univ. Kirk*, pp. 610-613. Spottiswoode omits articles 9 and 10, the former of which gives power to the Assembly to censure the bishop; also the clause in the 3rd article touching the powers

At the close of the Assembly 5000 pounds Scots were distributed by the royal commissioner as salaries to the fixed moderators of presbyteries, at the rate of a 100 pounds Scots to each, in accordance with the resolution of the Linlithgow Assembly in 1606. There is a Latin proverb that money has no smell.¹ It was otherwise with the money pocketed by the moderators on this occasion. That it was given in accordance with a previous statute, and after the business of the Assembly was concluded, should have obviated all suspicion of bribery; yet such a charge was freely made at the time by the Presbyterians, and has been repeated by several historians since. The distribution was certainly inopportune, and open to not unnatural suspicion.²

There were few Assemblies of these years in which the familiar names of the marquis of Huntly and the earls of Angus and Errol did not appear. A petition was presented from them to this Glasgow Assembly craving that they might be liberated from the excommunications under which they were lying. They were now in different prisons—Huntly in Stirling, Angus in Glasgow, and Errol in Edinburgh—under the charge of having relapsed into popery. Huntly, to secure his liberty, offered to sign the Confession of Faith; Angus promised to do the same, but on reflection he preferred to abandon his country, and went to France. The fate of Errol was the saddest of all. He agreed to sign the Confession, but the very night after, he was seized with such remorse of conscience that he attempted suicide in prison. He confessed his dissimulation with many tears next morning

of the Assembly over the bishop, and the clause in the 4th article requiring the assistance of the ministers in the ordination of a presbyter. He is severely censured for the omissions by

Dr. Cook, *Hist.* ii. 227-237, and Dr. Grub, *Hist.* ii. 294.

¹ *Pecunia non olet.*

² Spottiswoode, iii. 207.

to Spottiswoode, who records that "the nobleman was of a tender heart, and of all that I have known the most conscientious in his profession; and thereupon to his dying was used by the Church with greater lenity than were others of that sect."¹ The eyes of Scottish ecclesiastics were still blinded to the abominable cruelty and injustice of these persecutions. Calderwood, who laments over the banishment of the six ministers, has nothing to say against the imprisonment of the popish nobles, but he censures the earl of Dunbar for giving the earl of Errol his liberty, and for not having his lands and rents confiscated to the Crown.²

Spottiswoode was called to London by the king in the September following the Assembly, and asked to bring with him two of the titular Scottish bishops. He selected Lamb of Brechin and Hamilton of Galloway, and, on their first audience, the king explained the object for which he had summoned them. What follows is Spottiswoode's report of his majesty's conversation: "That he had to his great charge recovered the bishoprics forth of the hands of those that possessed them, and bestowed the same upon such as he hoped should prove worthy of their places; but since he could not make them bishops, nor could they assume that honour to themselves, and that in Scotland there was not a sufficient number to enter them to their charge by consecration, he had called them to England, that being consecrated themselves they might at their return give ordination to those at home, and so the adversaries' mouths be stopped, who said that he did take upon him to create bishops, and bestow spiritual offices, which he never did, nor would he presume to do, acknowledging that authority to belong to Christ alone and those whom

¹ Spottiswoode, iii. 203.

² Calderwood, vii. 159.

He had authorised with His power." The archbishop represented that the Church of Scotland, because of old usurpations, might regard this action as subjection to the Church of England. The king answered that he had provided against that danger by purposely excluding the two English primates whose predecessors had claimed jurisdiction over the Scottish Church.¹

Before the consecration, Dr. Andrewes, bishop of Ely, raised the question of orders, and pressed that the titular bishops-elect "must first be ordained presbyters, as having received no ordination from a bishop." Dr. Bancroft, archbishop of Canterbury, maintained that "there was no necessity for this, seeing that where bishops could not be had, the ordination given by presbyters must be esteemed lawful, otherwise that it might be doubted if there were any lawful vocation in most of the reformed churches." The primate's opinion was supported by Dr. Abbot, bishop of London, who further cited the historical cases of St. Ambrose and Nectarius, both of whom were laymen consecrated *per saltum* to the episcopate.² The majority of the bishops concurred with Bancroft and Abbot, and, this difficulty being overcome, the three Scottish prelates were consecrated by the bishops of London, Ely, Rochester, and Worcester, in the chapel of London House, on Sunday 21st October 1610.

Two exceptions are usually taken to this ordination of the bishops in London—the one that it was English, the other that it was Episcopal. There is no denying either fact, whatever blame may be imputable for the one or the other. The Scottish Episcopate came at this time from England, and so it is probable did Christianity in the first ages. But a closer and more pertinent analogy is

¹ Spottiswoode, iii. 209.

Robertson's *Hist. Christian Ch.* i.

² For Ambrose and Nectarius see 246, 249.

supplied by the new English Bible, which came to Scotland the very year after the bishops (1611), and yet no country has revered more than Scotland the translation of the Anglican divines. The same men who consecrated the three Scottish bishops had a chief hand, notably bishop Andrewes, in providing Scotland with its Bible. And if it be said that the original of the Bible came from Palestine, so did the order of the Episcopate, which the Anglican bishops merely transmitted, as they did the English Scriptures, to North Britain.¹

The second objection, that the ordination was Episcopal, opens the main issue between Episcopalian and Presbyterian, and belongs to the domain of ecclesiastical polity rather than of history. However the question may be settled, no one who places any value on the act of ordination can consistently blame Episcopalians for seeking the ministerial commission from "the Historic Episcopate," instead of resting content with the miserable subterfuge of pseudo-bishops, the titulars and tulchans, condemned alike by Episcopalian and Presbyterian.

Public opinion in Scotland was very much divided as to the introduction of Episcopacy. The nobles, who were not Roman Catholics, were as a body in favour of the change, although some of their order, enriched with the old Church properties, regarded it with considerable distrust, from a suspicion that the king, instigated by the

¹ Dr. Rankin, *Hist. Scot.* ed. Story, ii. 485, has the following criticism on the English consecration. "It does strike one as odd, being unhistoric and mal-geographic, to hear tell of a Scottish Episcopal Church, not only the orders of which, but the very idea of which, came from England." It is true as to the channel of the orders, but "the very idea" was a good deal older than the

Christianity of either Scotland or England. And, might it not strike an unprejudiced witness as equally odd and unhistoric to speak of a "Scottish Presbyterian Church," seeing that its Church polity came from the French Huguenots, its Bible from the English bishops, and its Confession and Catechisms from the Westminster divines, who were mostly English Puritans?

English bishops, would demand for the support of the episcopate a restoration of at least a portion of the ecclesiastical lands and rentals. The ministers were more divided, and doubtless from less mercenary motives. In the strongholds of Presbytery—Fife, Merse, the Lothians, and to a less extent Ayr and Lanarkshire—the large majority of ministers were Presbyterian ; in all the other districts the ministers were mostly in favour of Episcopacy. Among the great body of the people the general feeling was one of indifference to Church government, coupled with the desire to accept, for the sake of peace and order, what had been agreed upon by the Assembly and by the Parliament. The settlement of 1610 lasted for more than a quarter of a century, longer than any other polity since the Reformation in 1560 ; and when it fell, the fall was due to other causes than opposition to the principle of Episcopacy.

CHAPTER X

JAMES VI.—FROM RESTORATION OF EPISCOPAL SUCCESSION, 1610, TO THE DEATH OF THE KING, 1625

Consecration of other ten bishops—Spottiswoode alone qualified for a bishopric—Mediocrity of other bishops—King's instructions to bishops—Parliament of 1612 ratifies Episcopal Government—Bishop Cowper of Galloway—Death of prince Henry, and of David Lindsay, titular bishop of Ross—Persecution of Romanists—Execution of Ogilvie the Jesuit—Spottiswoode succeeds Gladstones in archbishopric of St. Andrews—Frequent translations of bishops—Death of marquis of Huntly—University degrees regarded as papistical—Progress of Scotland—Spottiswoode's suggested reforms—Assembly at Aberdeen, 1616—Its enactments for liturgy, grammar schools, church registers—King's Five Articles proposed—King visits Scotland, 1617—Holds Parliament—Its enactments—Dissatisfaction of Presbyterians therewith—King's Book of Sports—Assembly at St. Andrews, 1617—King's displeasure with the bishops—Patrick Forbes, bishop of Aberdeen—Perth Assembly, 1618, accepts the King's Five Articles—More persecution of Romanists—Synod of Dort—Parliament of 1621 ratifies Perth Articles—William Forbes minister in Edinburgh, and afterwards its first bishop—Deaths of eminent Presbyterian ministers, and of James VI.

THE three bishops on their return to Scotland proceeded with the consecration of the prelates nominated for the other sees. Gladstones was consecrated archbishop of St. Andrews in his primatial city, and in a letter dated 3rd May 1611, he informed the king that all the bishops had been then consecrated.¹

¹ Melville's *Diary*, p. 804; *Original Letters of Reign of James Sixth*, i. 265-270.

Of the whole thirteen bishops, Spottiswoode alone was conspicuous for anything like scholarship or ability. He was probably as much of a statesman as a prelate, or was made so by the political exigencies of the time. When Gladstones died in 1615, he succeeded him in the primacy; and Charles I., twenty years later, was sufficiently ill-advised to make him chancellor of Scotland. The history he wrote, frequently cited in these pages, is lucid in style and an interesting narrative of Church affairs from 1527 to 1625, free from the rancour which disfigures the history of his able Presbyterian contemporary, David Calderwood.¹

The Church on its re-organisation in 1610 needed eminently wise and able men for its rulers, bishops of exceptional tact, patient to bear with long-standing prejudices, and in sympathy with the national love of independence. The prelates of James's appointment possessed few of these qualities. An English statesman, who had heard Lamb preaching on a public occasion, before he became bishop of Brechin, remarked that instead of a lamb he found a sheep in the pulpit. Gladstones, who as primate ought to have had special qualifications for a position difficult to fill at any time, and doubly so at that time, was entirely devoid of administrative ability or tact. He was in every sense a mediocre man, and brought little credit to the Church during the few years of his primacy; while Spottiswoode says "he was of an easy nature, and induced by those he trusted to do many things injurious to the see." The bishops were, no doubt, heavily handicapped by the manner of their appointment. They were not the choice of the people, or of the clergy, but the king's bishops in virtue of what he was pleased to style his prerogative. Though the men were not personally discreditable, they were weak representatives of the episcopal

¹ Dr. M'Crie, *Life of Andrew Melville*, ed. 1856, p. 390.

order. The manner of their appointment made them still more objectionable, and altogether they contributed much to the unpopularity of Episcopacy in Scotland. The Church, under their guidance, instead of coming out into the open field and throwing itself upon the support of the people, claiming their adherence to it as the Reformed Catholic Church, representative of the faith of the first Christian ages in Scotland, was always cowering under the shelter of the Crown, or the High Commission, or the Parliament. All through the seventeenth century, Episcopacy was dogged by the baneful shadow of the king's prerogative. This is the key to the chequered history of Scottish Episcopacy, as it was the main cause of its unpopularity, and of its practical inefficiency as an Establishment down to the Revolution. It was the same, though in altered circumstances, after that event. Established or dis-established, it was the Church's fate to be miserably bound in trammels to the Stuart dynasty, and to have the hands of its governing bishops fettered by Erastian bonds.

Early in 1611 the king sent instructions for the clergy, which were accepted at a meeting of the bishops in Edinburgh. Among these were the following:—That the archbishop and bishops should reside in the city of their cathedral church and endeavour to repair the same—a somewhat formidable task for most of them—that bishops should visit their dioceses every three years, and the archbishop his province every seven; that “although laic elders have neither warrant in the Word, nor example of the primitive Church,” yet was it necessary that wise and discreet laymen should be selected to aid the minister in repairing the fabric of the church, providing elements for the holy communion, and contributions for the poor; that no minister should be admitted without trial and

laying on of hands by the bishop and other ministers, according to a uniform order of service to be printed ; that the king should be petitioned to call, when required by the Church, a meeting of the General Assembly ; that the Assembly should consist of bishops, deans, archdeacons, and ministers elected by their brethren ; that young men should not be allowed to preach until they were ordained.¹ There was little to be objected to in the principle of these regulations, but very much in the source from which they came,—the king in Whitehall, instead of the Church, speaking through her constitutional courts.

The episcopal order which had received the sanction of the Church in the Assembly of 1610 was still without legal confirmation by the State ; and the Act of 1592 disestablishing the titular episcopate was as yet unrepealed. To give legal sanction to Episcopacy, Parliament met at Edinburgh in October 1612. It ratified the Assembly's action of two years before, and rescinded the Act of 1592.²

Gavin Hamilton, bishop of Galloway, died in 1612 after a short tenure of his episcopate, and was succeeded by William Cowper, minister of Perth. It is unnecessary for the purposes of history to give a dreary catalogue of bishops whose names, after their death, were probably little heard of beyond their own dioceses, but Cowper was not a bishop of that stamp. He was distinguished not less for his learning and good life than for the singular eloquence

¹ Spottiswoode, iii. 210-212.

² The two articles of the Glasgow Assembly regarding the censure of bishops by the Assembly, and their age and services on ordination to the episcopate, were both omitted ; and as they are suspiciously dropped by Spottiswoode in his narrative of the Assembly, their omission by this Parliament may have been due to his

influence. Cook, in his *Hist. Ch. Scot.* ii. 236, note, while blaming the archbishop severely, if he meant deliberately to misrepresent the facts, adds—"It is proper, however, to observe that most unwarrantable freedom was taken with the archbishop's manuscript." See on this, Editor's preface to Spottiswoode, pp. v. to xvii.

which made him the first preacher of his day. On public occasions, such as the consecration of a bishop, he was frequently appointed the preacher, both before and after his elevation to the episcopate. He was like other gifted men whom we have named, Knox and Melville to wit, inordinately sensitive to public criticism; and as he had said some hard things against Episcopacy when it was popular to abuse it, he laid himself specially open now to the animadversion of his former friends who did not forget his vulnerable heel. During his seven years' tenure of the see the puritans persistently worried him, but he never wavered in his later convictions. Speaking of Episcopacy he writes, "I esteem it a lawful, ancient, and necessary government. I see not, nor have read of any Church which wanted it before our time; only the abuses of it by pride, tyranny, and idleness have brought it into misliking. From those evils I pray the Lord preserve his servants that now are, or hereafter shall be called to those places. But there is no reason why a thing good in itself should be condemned or rejected for the evil of abuse, for so no good thing at all would be retained in the Church."¹

The country had the misfortune to lose the king's eldest son, prince Henry, who died at St. James's 6th November 1612, in the midst of the preparations for the marriage of his sister Elizabeth to Frederick, Elector Palatine of the Rhine. The changes consequent upon

¹ Account of bishop Cowper, prefixed to his Works, published at London, 1623, pp. 6, 7. Spottiswoode, iii. 258; Calderwood, vii. 180, 349-351; Lawson, *Hist. Ch.* pp. 324-334. Dr. M'Crie says in his *Life of Aleville*, p. 390, ed. 1856, that Cowper's sermons "are perhaps superior to any sermons of that age." M'Crie tells the story of a staunch

Presbyterian woman who had greatly admired Cowper's Perth sermons finding her way to the bishop's residence in Edinburgh, and rebuking him for deserting the old cause. The bishop, to excuse himself, said he had found new light. "Oh yes," replied she, "ye had ane candle afore, and now I see ye have twa. That's your new licht."

his death were momentous to the nation. Prince Charles became heir to the Crown, and on a later day Elizabeth's grandson, George I., stepped in between her brother's descendants and the throne.

In 1613 there passed away, at the age of eighty-three, the last survivor of the Reformation struggle, David Lindsay, bishop of Ross, better known as minister of Leith, where he had officiated without interruption from 1560. Like Cowper he had used his eloquence against episcopacy before accepting a bishopric. His promotion was due to the king's favour, and was one of the few transactions in which James was true to the friendship of his early years. Spottiswoode was Lindsay's son-in-law, and he records that the old minister and bishop "was a man universally beloved and well esteemed by all wise men."¹

The Roman Catholics were still numerous, especially in the north, and kept up their worship and customs, openly or secretly, in spite of the "diligence committees" appointed to hunt them down. In this respect Episcopacy abated nothing of the fervour of Presbytery; it was equally zealous, and equally intolerant. In Aberdeen, Caithness, and Edinburgh, we read of lairds and tradesmen, priests and advocates, being imprisoned and banished for the profession of papacy.² Spottiswoode had shown his protestant zeal by wrecking the church of New Abbey in 1609, and burning "books, copes, chalices, pictures, images, and such other popish trash, on a mercat day in the High Street of Dumfries."³ In 1614-15 he had an opportunity of exhibiting his zeal in a different form, and in a manner which has covered his name, not undeservedly,

¹ Spottiswoode, iii. 220; Calderwood, vii. 178, mentions his decease without note or comment.

² *Records of Kirk-Session of Aberdeen*, pp. 33, 70, 86, 91, 180;

Calderwood, vi. 679.

³ *Original Letters, Reign of James Sixth*, i. 410; Forbes-Leith's *Narrative*, p. 290.

with still greater reproach. John Ogilvie, a Jesuit missionary, eldest son of Ogilvie of Drum, near Keith, had arrived from the Jesuit college of Gratz, with some other Romanists, in the previous year. The archbishop wrote to the king that "it had pleased God to cast in his hands a Jesuit,"—meaning that he had apprehended Ogilvie in Glasgow. Upon being examined before the archbishop and a commission as to his residence and business in Scotland, Ogilvie declined to compromise his friends. The court then hit upon the barbarous device of torturing him, so as to prevent sleep and compel a confession. But as soon as he was permitted his natural rest he denied all he had confessed. He repudiated the authority of Acts of Parliament on religious subjects as beyond its jurisdiction; "for which," said he, "I will not give a rotten fig. And as for the king, if he play the runagate from God, as he and you all do, I will not acknowledge him more than this old hat." Proceeding in the same strain he added, "I am a subject as free as the king is as a king: I came by the commandment of my superior into this kingdom, and if I were even now forth of it, I would return; neither do I repent anything but that I have not been so busy as I should in that which you call perverting of subjects. I am accused of declining the king's authority, and will do it still in matter of religion, for with such matters he hath nothing to do; and this which I say the best of your ministers do maintain, and if they be wise will continue of the same mind. Some questions were moved to me which I refused to answer, because the proposers were not judges in controversies of religion, and therefore I trust you cannot infer anything against me." "But I hope," said the archbishop, "you will not make this a controversy of religion whether the king being deposed by the pope may be lawfully killed." To this he

replied, "It is a question among the doctors of the Church ; many hold the affirmative, not improbably ; but as that point is not yet determined, so if it shall be concluded, I will give my life in defence of it ; and to call it unlawful, I will not, though I should save my life by saying it." Ogilvie was condemned to death on the 10th March 1615, and in the afternoon of the same day was hanged in the public street of Glasgow.¹

In the same year, 1615, Spottiswoode succeeded Gladstones in St. Andrews, and Law, bishop of Orkney, was translated to Glasgow. Orkney also was filled by a bishop translated from Dunblane. Translation of bishops was the order of the day, although it is not easy to imagine what could have induced a prelate to exchange the leafy seclusion of "Auld Dunblane" for the stormy Orkneys, unless it were the richer endowment. The saintly Leighton had no desire to exchange it, even to be metropolitan of Glasgow ; only Leighton was Leighton, a prince among bishops. Blackburn, bishop of Aberdeen, died in 1616, and was succeeded by Alexander Forbes, translated from Caithness, while the clergy and people wished another Forbes—Patrick, a much abler man—at that time parish priest at Keith. Of him we shall hear more as bishop of Aberdeen at the next vacancy of the see in 1618. The frequency of episcopal translations suggests that the bishops were not comfortable in their seats, or that they were very ambitious, each esteeming his brother's vineyard better than his own.²

The marquis of Huntly about this time again disturbs the peace of the Church. Once more he had relapsed,

¹ Spottiswoode, iii. 222-226 ; Forbes-Leith, *Narrative*, etc. pp. 310-314 ; Pitcairn's *Criminal Trials*, iii. 350-354 ; *Original Letters of James Sixth*, ii. 385-391 ; Calderwood,

vii. 196.

² *Original Letters, James Sixth*, ii. 437, and preface, p. xxxvii. ; Spottiswoode, iii. 227 ; Calderwood, vii. 197, 201, 203.

and had now aggravated his original sin by prohibiting his dependents and tenants from attending church. For this he was committed to Edinburgh castle on a warrant from the High Commission, but in a few days he was released by order of the chancellor. The bishops remonstrated against the chancellor's interference, and sent bishop Forbes of Caithness to represent their views to the king. The ministers, as in the earlier days, attacked the chancellor from their pulpits, "making great exclamations as against one that abused his place and power." He increased their resentment by telling the bishops that "he cared not what their Church thought of him." Huntly also found his way to the king; for in spite of all his relapses, he continued in high favour with James. In the end, it was agreed that he should be absolved by the archbishop of Canterbury. The Scottish bishops resented this as an additional encroachment upon their rights. Both the king and Dr. Abbot, the English primate, wrote to archbishop Spottiswoode disclaiming any assumption of authority over the Scottish Church; and it was finally settled that Huntly should present a supplication to the General Assembly and be absolved anew, which was accordingly done at Aberdeen.¹ As this may be the last occasion of our naming the oft-relapsing and repenting marquis, we may add that he died at Dundee in 1636, a penitent and devout son of the Roman Church, with whose rites he was buried in Elgin cathedral.²

An event of some interest in academic circles took place in the year 1616. Among many things reputed by the ministers since the Reformation to be popish

¹ Dr. Abbot, in his letter to Spottiswoode says, "We well know that as the kingdom of Scotland is a free and absolute monarchy, so the Church of Scotland is entire in itself and inde-

pendent upon any other Church.' See letter in Spottiswoode, iii. 233-235.

² Spottiswoode, iii. 230-236; Calderwood, vii. 218, 226.

and superstitious were the ancient degrees of doctor, master, and bachelor, conferred by the Universities for distinction in learning. King James had the ambition to revive them in Scotland. They were still conferred in England, but there, according to the extreme Scottish faction, "the Reformation was not a perfect work." Dr. Young, dean of Winchester, was sent as the king's representative on the occasion of their revival at St. Andrews. The principals of its three colleges and several ministers received the degree of doctor of divinity, while others declined it as popish.¹ It is long since any savour of popery has been suspected, even in the degree of D.D., and it is now scarcely credible that degrees of learning were ever placed in the category of Romish superstitions.

A speech delivered to the Estates in this year, 1616, by Sir Thomas Hamilton, lord Binning, founder of the house of Haddington, and an able statesman and lawyer, gives a graphic description of the improvement in the social condition of Scotland. The change seems to have been entirely due to the strong executive that the king was enabled to form after his accession to the English throne. The picture which he draws of the country before the union of the Crowns is as black as any that was ever painted of mediæval Scotland. Fifty years of the Reformation had not civilised it; and Edinburgh, the very centre of that movement, is here described by one who knew it well as "being the ordinary place of butchery, revenge, and daily fights." Contrast the change described by the same hand, after thirteen years of firmer government—"These and all other abominations, which, settled by inveterate custom and impunity, appeared to be of desperate remedy, had been so repressed, punished, and abolished by your majesty's care, power, and expenses, as no nation on earth

¹ Calderwood, vii. 222.

can now compare with our prosperities, whereby we are bound to retribute to your majesty if it were the very half of our heart's blood."¹

The condition of the Scottish Church, however, did not yet satisfy the king and his advisers; and Spottiswoode, when in England in 1615, drew up a list of its principal requirements. These were, a form of divine service, a confession of faith akin to the English confession, an order for the election of bishops and ministers, forms for marriage, baptism, and holy communion, the use of confirmation, and a code of canons and constitutions. "These things," said Spottiswoode, "must be advised and agreed upon in a general assembly of the clergy which must be drawn to the form of the convocation house here in England."²

The draft of a new Confession of Faith had been submitted in 1612 to the two archbishops, but the Confession actually passed by the Assembly of 1616 was far from being conformable to the Anglican Articles, and was more rigidly Calvinistic as to election and predestination than the Confession of 1560. Spottiswoode's desire for an amendment in the mode of election of bishops was laudable, but it is significant that he speaks of the future, "in time hereafter," not of the present, as if afraid to touch the sacred ark of the king's prerogative. Not less laudable was the resolution to have his proposals submitted to the General Assembly for approval, although his idea of having the Assembly remodelled after the pattern of the English Convocation was highly impolitic for Scotland.

The Assembly met at Aberdeen in August 1616, Spottiswoode presiding as metropolitan, with the earl of

¹ *The Melros Papers*, i. 273; cited by Burton, vi. 15, 16. Burton, vi. 16-26, gives instances confirmatory of lord Binning's statements.

² Grub, ii. 305; Sprott, *Scottish Liturgies of the reign of James VI.* Introduction, p. xv.

Montrose as royal commissioner. It was enacted that a confession of faith should be compiled which all should swear to before being admitted to any office in Church or State; that no man should be permitted to practise medicine unless he had first satisfied the bishop of the diocese touching his religion; that a liturgy or book of common prayer should be drawn up for the use of the Church; that the Acts of the General Assemblies should be collected to serve for canons of discipline; that children should be carefully catechised and confirmed by the bishops, or, in their absence, by ministers employed in the visitation of churches; that grammar schools should be established in all parishes where the same might be conveniently done, and that a register should be kept of baptisms, marriages, and burials by the minister of every parish.¹

The requirement of a guarantee of orthodoxy from practitioners in medicine was a precaution against the action of the Jesuits, who, under the guise of ministering to the sick, were industriously propagating their creed. In the Assembly of 1601 a commission had been appointed to revise Knox's Book of Common Order, but nothing came of it. By the king's desire the matter was again mooted in this Assembly, which appointed a small committee, the result of whose labours was "The Book of Common Prayer and administration of the Sacraments, with other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of Scotland." The book, however, was never printed.² The word "Liturgy" in the popular sense of a Prayer Book, and not as restricted to the Eucharistic Office, appears, for the first

¹ *Original Letters, James Sixth's Reign*, i. 293; ii. 445, 446, 481-488; Calderwood, vii. 220-242; *Book of Univ. Kirk*, 589-599. Spottiswoode, iii. 235, 236, says nothing of the proposed Confession of Faith. Sprott,

Lit. King James VI. p. xvii.

² *Historical Account of Scot. Com. Office*, by Dr. Dowden, pp. 27, 28; *Scottish Liturgies of Reign of James VI.*, ed. Dr. G. W. Sprott.

time in Scottish usage, in the Acts of this Assembly. The order now passed to establish grammar schools in every parish was the foundation of the parish school system of Scotland, which so many modern writers erroneously attribute to the initiative of John Knox. Not to Knox, but to Spottiswoode; and not to him alone, but also in part, as we shall see, to later legislation by Charles the First—belongs the credit of the establishment of parish schools.

The king accepted all the enactments of the Aberdeen Assembly excepting the one on Confirmation, which he characterised as "a mere hotch-potch, and not so clear as was requisite." As it stood, the article was open to objection from the uncertainty as to who should confirm the children. His majesty made this more clear in the five articles which he now submitted for insertion among the canons of the Church. They prescribed (1) Kneeling on reception of the Holy Communion; (2) Private communion to the sick; (3) Private baptism in case of necessity; (4) Observance of the holy days commemorative of Christ's Birth, Death, Resurrection, Ascension, and the Advent of the Holy Ghost; (5) Confirmation of children. Under this last head it is ordered that "the minister catechise all children of eight years of age, and see that they know the Belief, the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and the other questions in the small catechism used in the Church, and that the bishop on his visitation should bless them, with prayer for increase of grace."¹

These are in substance the same as the famous Five Articles of Perth passed in 1618. For politic reasons the archbishop represented to the king that as they had not been submitted to the Church courts, it would be mean-

¹ Spottiswoode, iii. 236, 237.

while imprudent to include them in the code of canons. James consented to their suspension, seeing that he was coming to Scotland next year, and would settle everything in person. His visit, he added in a letter to the Council, "did proceed of a longing he had to return to the place of his breeding, a *salmon-like instinct*." The king forgot that the salmon returns every year, and he had now been absent from "the place of his breeding" for thirteen years.

Great preparations were made for the king's visit in 1617.¹ Holyrood was refurnished; and the chapel royal within its walls, the same that his mother, queen Mary, had used, was fitted up for a richer ritual than had obtained in Scotland for many years. English carpenters landed at Leith with "the portraits of the apostles to be set in the pews or stalls," and the popular imagination caught the idea that, in the trail of organs and images, the mass would be set up. The bishop of Galloway, as dean of the chapel royal, took fright at the old cry of "No popery," and sent a letter to the king subscribed by the archbishop of St. Andrews, the bishops of Aberdeen and Brechin, and divers of the ministers of Edinburgh, begging that "for the offence that was taken he might stay the affixing of these portraits." The king in an angry letter told them "that in their ignorance they could not distinguish between pictures intended for ornament and decoration, and images erected for worship and adoration; that they could endure lions, dragons, and devils to be figured in their churches, but would not allow the like place to the patriarchs and apostles."²

The king arrived in Edinburgh on the 16th May

¹ See *Register of Privy Council of Scot.*, ed. by Dr. Masson, vol. xi. A.D. 1616-1619.

² Spottiswoode, iii. 238, 239. It would appear from the king's letter

that they were not painted portraits but carved wooden figures of the Apostles. They were not completed in time, and thus the matter dropped.

1617, and remained in Scotland until August. He was accompanied by several English divines, among whom were Dr. Andrewes, the learned bishop of Ely, and "a certain small-bodied and red-faced Dr. William Laud," then dean of Gloucester, who was now making his first acquaintance with an ecclesiastical field that was to become familiar, if not fatal, to him.¹ Services of the Anglican type were held in the chapel royal, and on Whitsun Day, the 8th June, the bishop of Ely preached, and the Eucharist was celebrated according to the English Office, the two Scottish archbishops and several of the bishops being present.

On the 17th June Parliament met. Spottiswoode preached, and the king made a long speech, recalling what he had done for justice and for religion, referring to the number of churches still unplanted, to the insufficient maintenance of the ministers, and to his appointment of justices and constables, which had promoted the peace and good order of the realm. He concluded by saying that his ambition was equal to that of the Roman Emperor, who found Rome a city of bricks and left it a city of marble. Much altercation followed on choosing the lords of the Articles, the king's nominees being frequently rejected, greatly to his displeasure. The first article proposed by the lords was touching the king's authority in causes ecclesiastical, and ran thus, "Whatsoever conclusion was taken by his majesty with advice of the archbishops and bishops in matters of external policy, the same should have the power and strength of an ecclesiastical law." The bishops, to their credit, remonstrated, and declared that the advice and consent of the presbyters was also required. James said

¹ See *Register of Privy Council of Scot.*, ed. by Dr. Masson, vol. xi. A.D. 1616-1619. Laud was after-

wards bishop of St. Davids, bishop of London, and archbishop of Canterbury.

he did not object to that, but he added—"To have matters ruled as they have been in your General Assemblies I will never agree, for the bishops must rule the ministers, and the king rule both, in matters indifferent and not repugnant to the Word of God." The clause was then adjusted and passed in this form—"That whatsoever his majesty should determine in the external government of the Church, with the advice of the archbishops, bishops, and a competent number of the ministry, should have the strength of a law."

It did not satisfy the Presbyterian ministers, even in this modified shape, and their historian describes it as "like to cut the cords of the remanent liberties of our Kirk." Some of them presented a formal protest against it, with the result that three of their number, Simson, minister of Dalkeith, Ewart of Edinburgh, and Calderwood of Crailing (the historian), were summoned before the High Commission which met in the presence of the king at St. Andrews. Simson and Ewart were deprived, and Calderwood was not only deprived but committed to the Tolbooth till he should find caution to leave the kingdom. Calderwood argued the matter with greater pertinacity than courtesy before the king, and justified the action of the Assemblies in their defence of the liberties of the Church.¹ After a time the king withdrew the obnoxious article, and substituted an alternative of a still more objectionable character, which put the king's licence into the hands of a chapter for the election of a bishop, and at the same time compelled the chapter to elect the person nominated by the king. This was similar to the English form of *congé d'élire*, which still obtains in filling

¹ The historian has given the discussion at much length in his history. See Calderwood, vii. 249-282; Spottiswoode, iii. 240-247. If Calder-

wood's report may be trusted, the conduct of some members of the High Commission, including the bishops, towards him was very disgraceful.

a vacant see in England. It was a violation of the Concordat at Leith, which placed the election of bishops under the control of the Church, and a reversion to the worst abuse of pre-Reformation times. And yet there was no protest from the Scottish prelates, who thus tamely acquiesced in an usurpation opposed to constitutional principles, certain to be unpopular with Scotsmen, and calculated to vitally injure the Church.

James, after arranging for a meeting of the General Assembly, on the 4th August turned his back on his native kingdom, never to see it more. On his way south through Lancashire he was struck with the puritanical observance of Sunday, and concluded that this was the reason why the Roman Catholics, who were numerous in that district, refused to be converted from their creed. The king accordingly published his well-known "Declaration to encourage Recreations and Sports on the Lord's Day," and caused it to be read in all the parish churches of Lancashire. Had archbishop Abbot not remonstrated it would have been read in all the churches of the kingdom. The king's action caused no little uneasiness to the puritans in Scotland, who had probably forgotten that John Knox greatly enjoyed a game at bowls on Sundays after sermon.¹ The king gave two reasons for his Book of Sports—the one that Roman priests might not have it in their power to say "that no honest mirth or recreation is lawful or tolerable in our religion"; and the other, expressive of an argument often used in later years, that the repression of rational enjoyment on Sundays "in place thereof sets up filthy tipplings and drunkenness, and breeds a number of idle and discontented speeches in their ale-houses."

The Assembly met at St. Andrews 25th November

¹ See Hessey's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 269, 270.

1617 under lord Binning, now earl of Haddington, as commissioner, to consider the articles proposed by the king. Some ministers craved delay that they might explain the changes to the people, others offered opposition on various grounds, and several withdrew from the meetings. The Assembly was out of humour, and nothing was done beyond agreeing to give private communion to the sick, and ordering the clergy to administer, with their own hands, the sacramental elements to the people. The report of the proceedings greatly displeased the king, and he relieved his mind by violent letters to the two archbishops, in which he said—"We are come to that age as we will not be content to be fed with broth, as one of your own coat was wont to speak, and think this your doing a disgrace no less than protestation itself. Wherefore it is our pleasure, and we command you, the one of you by your deputy in St. Andrews and by yourself in Edinburgh, and the other of you in Glasgow, keep Christmas Day precisely, yourselves preaching and choosing your texts according to the time. And likewise, that ye discharge all mollification of stipends for this year to any minister whatsoever, such excepted as have testified their affection to our service at this time, by furthering at their power the acceptation of the articles proposed." A postscript was added in the king's own hand to this effect—"Since your Scottish Church hath so far contemned my clemency, they shall now find what it is to draw the anger of a king upon them." Not much sympathy will be felt for the archbishops under the royal lash, but the attempt to punish the refractory ministers by withholding a portion of their stipends was as mean as it was cowardly. The bishops happily succeeded in changing the king's resolution as to the stipends.¹

¹ *Original Letters, Reign of James Sixth*, ii. 520-526; Calderwood, vii.

Patrick Forbes, son of the laird of Corse in Aberdeenshire, became bishop of Aberdeen in 1618. He was a relative of Andrew Melville, studied under him in St. Andrews, and accompanied him to England during his temporary banishment in 1584. Forbes was ordained late in life, and became parish minister of Keith in 1611. In such high estimation was he held by the clergy and people of Aberdeen that they wished him for their bishop on the previous vacancy of the see. With much reluctance he accepted the office now, and was consecrated at St. Andrews by the primate in May 1618.¹

Nothing more was done by the king for another year, during which he continued sulking by the Thames at the despite shown to him by the Assembly. The bishops were meanwhile busy in their diocesan synods, explaining the proposed Articles to the clergy, and gaining the consent of many who had at first opposed them. On the 25th August 1618 another Assembly—the last for twenty years to come—was held at Perth under the earl of Haddington as commissioner, the archbishop of St. Andrews presiding, and maintaining in spite of opposition his right to the chair as primate of the Church. There was the usual attendance of bishops, of ministers from each presbytery, of nobles, barons, and burgesses by commission from the burgh towns. The king's letter was read by Dr. Young, dean of Winchester, and it was as studiously Erastian and offensive as autocratic folly could make it. There was no abatement of his claim by prerogative to enforce the Articles, if so it had pleased his majesty; and he assured the Assembly that he would be

284-286; Spottiswoode, iii. 248-252.

¹ Calderwood has never a good word for a bishop, and even this estimable and scholarly man he de-

scribes as "a hypocrite," who accepted the bishopric "to repair his broken lairdship."—*History*, vii. 291-296.

satisfied with nothing less than a simple acceptance of the whole Articles. They were the same as he had proposed two years before. The 1st enjoined kneeling at the Holy Communion ; the 2nd, private communion to the sick ; the 3rd, private baptism in cases of necessity for children ; the 4th, confirmation of the young ; and the 5th, the religious observance of the days of Christ's Birth, Passion, Resurrection, Ascension, and the sending down of the Holy Ghost. Three days' discussion was spent upon them, partly in private conference, and partly in the open Assembly. It was proposed to take them seriatim, but this was overruled, and the vote was taken on the acceptance or rejection of the Five Articles as they stood. Eighty-six members voted for their acceptance, including all the noblemen but one, the bishops, excepting those of Argyll and of the Isles, who were absent, all the barons, and commissioners of burghs and about forty ministers ; one nobleman, lord Ochiltree, and forty ministers voted against them, and four declined to express an opinion. There was thus a majority altogether of two to one in favour of the Articles, while the ministerial vote was about equal. The Articles were ratified by the Scottish Privy Council on the 21st October following.¹

The persecution of the Romanists continued almost to the end of James's reign, and became so persistent that the pope was asked to intervene in their behalf before they were driven to despair. Gilbert Brown, the last abbot of New Abbey, near Dumfries, was warded in Blackness, and afterwards banished ; John Hamilton, a rector of Paris University, was seized in Scotland, and imprisoned in the Tower of London, where he died in 1610 ; Robert

¹ Spottiswoode, iii. 252-257 ; Calderwood, vii. 303-339 ; *Original Letters, James Sixth*, ii. 567-583.

The records of this Perth Assembly perished in the burning of the House of Parliament in 1834.

Creighton was confined in the Tolbooth of Edinburgh, and sentenced to be hanged at the market cross ; but, after six months' imprisonment, his sentence was commuted to one of banishment for life. Two Scottish Jesuits, Anderson and Moffat, were treated in the same way. Papists and Puritans were the two religious classes for whom the king had no tolerance, and to whom he showed almost no mercy.¹

In the year 1618, which witnessed the passing of the Perth Articles, the celebrated synod of Dort met in November to determine the controversies at issue between the Calvinists and Arminians.² It was attended by representatives of all the Reformed Churches on the Continent, excepting the French; and king James thought fit to send as delegates five divines, including Walter Balcanqual, son of the former Edinburgh minister of that name. Calvinism triumphed, and the tenets of the Arminians were condemned in five "articles"; but the decision in no way affected the British Churches except by occasioning the silly report, eagerly welcomed by a party in Scotland, that the synod had condemned the Five Articles of Perth.³

The ministers were required to read the Five Articles of Perth from the pulpit, and such of them as had opposed their passing refused to read or to observe them. In Edinburgh many of the protestant shopkeepers kept their booths open on Christmas Day, and numbers of the people, to gratify their preference for a sitting communion, flocked out of the city, where the ministers enforced kneeling, to the rural churches. This was repeated at Easter; and, as usual, a war of pamphlets signalised the strife between sitters and kneelers. Calderwood, the historian,

¹ See Bellesheim, iii. 400-414.

² Arminius, the founder of the school (born 1560, died 1609), was from 1603 professor at Leyden.

³ Dr. Wm. Cunningham, *Reformers*

and *Theology of the Reformation*, pp. 367-369, 435; Spottiswoode, iii. 258; Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, i. 479, 480; Collier, vii. 408-416.

and Dr. David Lindsay, bishop of Brechin, entered the lists with heavier controversial works on opposite sides. Lord Haddington, writing to the king in March 1619, gives a favourable account of an Edinburgh communion of this period. He states that "the nobles, councillors, and sessioners came first to the Table, and all upon their knees received the elements from the ministers—Ramsay and Galloway,—who gave them to each with their own hands. Their example," he says, "was generally followed by the congregation, so that neither man nor woman, during the space of four hours, offered to receive the sacrament sitting, except one base fellow."¹

Lord Haddington also reported to the king that the recusant ministers had resolved to disobey the Five Articles; and James, suspecting an attempt at organised opposition, summoned a meeting of the Three Estates—the last of his Scottish Parliaments—to give legal sanction to the Articles, and at the same time to provide a subsidy for the war into which he had been drawn in defence of his son-in-law, the Count Palatine. The Parliament met in Edinburgh, July 1621, with the marquis of Hamilton as royal commissioner, and, in a house unusually full, ratified the Perth Articles by 78 to 51 votes. This was the climax of the contest; but it did not silence the non-conforming ministers, whose opposition was still heard like the murmurs of a ground-swell after a storm at sea. Calderwood relates how a thunderstorm burst over the houses of Parliament on the last day of its sitting as the Articles were being signed, and he repeats the common cant of his party in the heading of a paragraph "God appeared angry at the concluding of the Articles." The other side were ready with the retort, "that it was to be taken for an approbation from Heaven, likening the same to the

¹ *Original Letters, James Sixth's Reign, anno 1619.*

thunderings and lightnings at the giving of the law to Moses." A thunderstorm in Edinburgh at the beginning of August was not such an uncommon phenomenon as to warrant the assumed portents on either side.¹

Another Dr. Forbes—one whom Charles I. subsequently raised to the new bishopric of Edinburgh—figures prominently in the year 1621. William Forbes was an Aberdonian born and bred. He was educated in the grammar school and in the Marischal College of Aberdeen, founded in 1593, and afterwards studied in several of the continental Universities, where he made the friendship of Grotius, Scaliger, and other distinguished scholars. He was offered the chair of Hebrew in Oxford, but declined it on account of his health.² He became successively minister of Alford, Monymusk, and St. Nicholas' church, Aberdeen, principal of Marischal College, and in 1621 one of four ministers added to the number already in Edinburgh. In the Perth Assembly he had taken a prominent part in defence of the Articles, and was recognised then as one of the ablest men on the side of Episcopacy. Forbes was both a learned divine and an eloquent preacher; but his high church principles provoked the opposition of his puritanic parishioners in Edinburgh. When the Town Council and kirk-session attempted to make inquisition, according to the usage of the time, into his doctrines and teaching, he caustically reprimanded them, and told their leader, William Rigg, a wealthy magistrate, that he had more need of catechising than to presume to catechise his teacher. Disorderly proceedings followed, and Rigg was warded in Blackness; but this was so little to the mind of Dr. Forbes that he

¹ Calderwood, vii. 488-505; Spottiswoode, iii. 261-263; *Original Letters*, ii. 656-662; *Acts Parl. Scot.* iv. 596, 597.

² Lippe's Introduction to Wodrow's Biographical Collections (New Spalding Club), pp. lxxii. seq.

resigned his charge and returned to Aberdeen, much to the satisfaction of its clergy and people. In a few years he was recalled to Edinburgh to fill—all too briefly—a more responsible position.¹

The Presbyterians were now much weakened by the death, imprisonment, and exile of their leading ministers. James Melville died at Berwick in 1614; Walter Balcanqual in 1616; Andrew Melville at Sedan in 1622; and John Welch at London, in the same year. John Forbes, brother of Dr. Patrick Forbes, bishop of Aberdeen, was still in exile; Bruce was relegated to Inverness, and Calderwood, on being released from prison, lived stealthily in Scotland for a time, and then retired to Holland, where he wrote his controversial treatise, *Altare Damascenum*. This odious and discreditable system of persecution was one of the worst features of the ecclesiastical government of James. It should not be forgotten that the Scottish Church had retained within its bounds from the Reformation downwards men of two different schools, and that while each side struggled, and not always scrupulously, for mastery over the other, there was no actual separation into opposite camps until after the Revolution of 1688-1689. This has to be borne in mind in reading the history of the Scottish Church from the Reformation to the Revolution.

There is little to record in the closing years of James the Sixth's reign, excepting the occasional squabbles in several districts, south and west, touching compliance with the Perth Articles. The king's civil administration of Scotland, especially after his accession to the English throne, when he had the power to enforce the laws, was

¹ See Life of Bishop William Forbes, prefixed to his *Considerationes Modeste*; Calderwood, vii. 516, 542,

571, 599-621; *Original Letters, Reign of James Sixth*, ii. 589, 634; Spottiswoode, iii. 268, 269.

marked by commendable sense and vigour, and brought order and prosperity to a kingdom too long distracted by contending factions. The same commendation cannot be bestowed upon his ecclesiastical policy, which was about as unwise and injurious as his imperious conceit and self-will could make it.

James died at his manor of Theobald on 27th March 1625. Spottiswoode relates the edifying scenes of his death-bed, and how he received much comfort from the reception of the holy communion, which Calderwood describes as "his viaticum after the English fashion." The two historians close their record with the death of king James, and nothing in their histories marks the difference between the two men and their respective attitudes so much as their narratives of the closing scene. Spottiswoode discredits his historic judgment by a fulsome eulogy of James as "the Solomon of this age," and Calderwood equally discredits himself by bitter rancour, raking up all the vile scandal of the time, and making of it a funeral pile for the reputation of James the Sixth and First.¹

¹ Spottiswoode, iii. 270, 271; Calderwood, vii. 632-638. Bellesheim, iii. 439, describes "the politronery and dissimulation so strangely blended in the monarch's character," and the selfish expediency which formed the rule of his conduct. In

the Appendix, p. 497, he reproduces a contemporary estimate of the king's character, noting, among other things, his growing tendency to drunkenness, altogether a far from pleasing picture of the pedant king.

CHAPTER XI

CHARLES I.—FROM HIS ACCESSION, 1625, TO THE INTRODUCTION OF CANONS AND ORDINAL, 1636

King's accession and marriage—Provides stipends to bishops and ministers—Calls on nobles to restore Church lands—Settlement of teinds and of parish schools by the king—New bishops—King's purpose to restore cathedrals of Iona and St. Andrews—Religious "revival" at Stewarton under Dickson, the minister—King visits Scotland in 1633—Crowned at Holyrood—Bishop Laud—Parliament confirms Episcopal government and worship—Earl of Rothes challenges the vote—Laud's sermon—Laud visits Dunblane—"Humble supplication" to king involves lord Balmerino—His trial, condemnation, and reprieve—King on return to London orders Scottish bishops and clergy to wear vestments—Erection of bishopric of Edinburgh and its first bishop, Dr. William Forbes—St. Giles' made the cathedral—Death of Patrick Forbes, bishop of Aberdeen—His services to the University and diocese—Bishops Wedderburn of Dunblane and Maxwell of Ross—Archbishop Spottiswoode chancellor in 1635—Grounds of dissatisfaction with the appointment—King's impolitic measures—Imposing the Canons and the Ordinal, 1636—Bishop Boyd of Argyll—Samuel Rutherford relegated to Aberdeenshire—the Aberdeen "Doctors."

CHARLES I. was proclaimed king of Scotland at the cross of Edinburgh on the 31st March 1625. After the fruitless wooing of the Infanta of Spain, a marriage was arranged in 1624 between Charles and Henrietta Maria, sister of Louis XIII., king of France. A few months after his accession she became his wife. The marriage contract stipulated that the queen should have the free exercise of her religion as a Roman Catholic, with a bishop and

priests of her own faith, and the education of her children until they were thirteen years of age. The conditions were much canvassed at the time, the last proviso being specially objected to, and with good reason, as the sequel showed.¹

The king completed his father's arrangements for dividing Edinburgh into four parishes, with two ministers to each, to be chosen not by the people, but by the Town Council. He would not tolerate the custom of the people's trying and censuring their ministers; and when the magistrates represented that it had prevailed from the Reformation, and been enjoined by the superintendents, Charles answered—"The narrative, if it be true, sheweth what a Reformation that was, and how evil advised; yet we believe not that either superintendent or minister would ever subject their doctrine to the trial of the popular voice. This is an Anabaptistical frenzy."²

Many of the ministers, and chiefly those who had been admitted before the Perth Assembly, had scruples about the Five Articles, and the king, in July 1626, considerably advised the bishops not to enforce them. The ministers who had been banished or imprisoned were also to be restored without compliance with the Articles, provided they did not actively oppose them; but ministers admitted in recent years were required to observe them. The king further urged upon the bishops the weekly catechising of the people by the ministers, and the establishment of schools in every parish, an instruction which was made effective a few years afterwards.³

¹ John Row, the historian of "the Kirk," reflects the mind of his school upon the marriage and its stipulations. "It is very remarkable that the queen's mass, the pest of the soul, and a most raging pestilence killing bodies, came to London together.

Oh that men had eyes in their heads to see, and hearts to consider the Lord's ways."—*Hist.* p. 339.

² *Original Letters, James Sixth's Reign*, ii. 780-791.

³ Balfour, *Works*, ii. 142-145.

Charles continued his father's policy in making more suitable provision for the incomes of the bishops and ministers. The ministers from 1560 downwards had sent forth "a steady wail of poverty." The evil was partly remedied by James's legislation, which considerably increased their stipends, and king Charles helped them still further by securing them the teinds or tithes which made their position independent. Some of the bishops had also profited by the liberality of James, who had purchased for their sees with his own money portions of the alienated Church lands; but the majority of them were still without adequate maintenance. Their beggarly condition might at least have saved them from the reproach of sordid motives for accepting their office. Burton makes in detail "sordid exposures"¹ of the robbery of the Church lands by the Scottish nobles and gentry, and remarks upon the mercenary considerations which influenced their conduct in the civil war that was impending. "If there were no better reason," he says, "for hunting out and exposing to view all these small items of personal history, something might be said for them as revelations of the social condition and character of the times. They have a broader political bearing, however, though it is not likely to be well seen by those who have not studied the events of a period thirty years later. What we have to carry out of the whole selfish and cunning struggle is the determined pertinacity of the hold maintained by powerful men in Scotland over the revenues of the old Church. In the separate battles in which, by a combination of craft and force, each individual holder baffled the Government in its attempts to endow the new hierarchy, we see the training of those who were getting ready to show a combined front

¹ From *Original Letters* (Bannatyne Club), cited by Burton, v. 446-461.

against any national measure likely to assail their personal interests.”¹

Scotland had not to wait long for the measure which disturbed the serenity of the possessors of Church lands. In November 1625 proclamation was made in Edinburgh of a general revocation by the new king of all ecclesiastical grants by the Crown, or acquisitions made in prejudice thereof, teinds included, both before and after the Annexation Act of 1587. Charles maintained that the Church lands were attached to ecclesiastical offices for duties done, and that the possession of them by laymen who were incapable of discharging these duties was distinctly illegal; and further, that as the Crown had actively aided or connived at the transference of the property, so the Crown had an equal right now to do justice and give every man his due. If this view had been enforced seventy years before, neither the equity nor the propriety of the claim could reasonably have been disputed; but after the possession of two generations the king's edict came too late. What it did was to weld together the nobles who were enriched by Church spoils in a determined opposition to the ecclesiastical policy of Charles. It was virtually the first act in the contest which led to open war twelve years afterwards, and it united nobles and Presbyterians in a common opposition to the Crown. In pursuance of the king's policy, lord Nithsdale was commissioned in 1628 to deal with the chief impropiators for a gratuitous surrender of the Church lands; but he met with so much opposition, and even threats of personal violence, that he speedily returned to Court.²

The king met with more success in augmenting the ministers' stipends by means of the teinds. Hitherto the ministers had been paid out of the thirds of the old Church

¹ Burton, *Hist. Scot.* v. 461.

² Burnet's *History*, i. 34, 35.

lands, and paid very badly, from the niggardliness of the lay impropiators, though the tithes were now more rigidly exacted by their new lay-owners than by the parsons of old. After a long process it was agreed in 1629 that the tithe should be commuted—that each heritor should have the option of commuting the tithe at the value of a fifth part of the rental of the land, the tenth of the produce being held to be, on an average, twice the amount of a tenth of the rent. Out of this commuted tithe, according to the valuation then made, the minister was to be paid his stipend, with a further possible claim upon the overplus of the valued teind beyond the stipend then awarded to him. This arrangement, confirmed by the Scots Parliament in 1633, continues to the present day.¹ The decret on the teinds declares “that it is necessary and expedient for the public welfare and peace of this our ancient kingdom, and for the better providing of kirks and ministers’ stipends, and for the establishing of schools and other pious uses, that each heritor have and enjoy his own teinds.”²

Schools were embraced in the benevolent policy of the king, and steps were taken at this time to secure a school for every parish. Archbishop Spottiswoode, in the Assembly of 1616, had moved for grammar schools in convenient centres, and the Assembly’s Act was ratified by the Privy Council in the same year, “that in every parish in this kingdom, where convenient means may be had for entertaining a school, a school shall be established.” The loophole in this enactment was found in the clause touching the “convenient means,” the lay impropiators seldom finding it convenient to supply the means for schools and

¹ Claims are still made and freely allowed on the unexhausted teinds or portion in the proprietor’s hand after

paying the minister’s stipend.

² *Acts Parl. Scot.* v. 189-207, 218, 219; Cook, ii. 330-332.

teachers. The Parliament of 1633 went a step farther, by a fresh Act ordering a school to be built in each parish, and the bishops and clergy were actively promoting the building and endowment of schools when the civil war broke out. If all the legislation of Charles I. had been on similar lines he would have left behind him a more grateful memory in his native country. But the good that men do is readily forgotten, while the evil that they do, albeit unwittingly, cleaves to their memory. So has it been with king Charles.

Law, archbishop of Glasgow, died in 1632, and was succeeded by Patrick Lindsay, bishop of Ross. As with many other bishops of this age there was nothing noteworthy in the character or career of either. Lindsay was succeeded in Ross by John Maxwell, minister in Edinburgh, who is more worthy of note as the joint-compiler with Wedderburn, bishop of Dunblane, of the ill-fated Service Book of 1637.

On the translation of Dr. Leslie from the bishopric of the Isles to that of Raphoe in 1638, Neil Campbell, son of a former bishop of Argyll of that name, was appointed his successor. During his episcopate the king made proposals for the restoration of the cathedral in Iona; and his majesty is also credited with having contemplated a more serious undertaking, namely, the restoration of Scotland's greatest cathedral, the ruined shrine of St. Andrews. Both projects were frustrated by the breaking out of the rebellion, and the two cathedrals still lie in ruins as monuments of the Reformers' zeal.¹

Two eminent Presbyterian ministers, frequently men-

¹ *Original Letters, Reign of James Sixth*, pref. p. xlii.; Keith's *Catalogue*, pp. 308-310 and 202, 264, 265; Balfour, ii. 192. The king ordered the bishop of Raphoe to re-

store to bishop Campbell two bells which Andrew Knox, formerly bishop of the Isles, had carried with him from Iona to Raphoe.

tioned, and both bearing the marks of confessors of their faith, died at this time—Bruce in 1631 and John Forbes, in Holland, about 1634.¹ The Presbyterians in these years had few distinguished divines; but new men were coming to the front to maintain their traditions and to fight the old fight under new phases. Prominent among these was David Dickson, minister at Irvine, who possessed singular powers of persuasive reasoning and was the instrument of a widespread revival in Ayrshire. For his opposition to the Perth Articles he had been relegated north to Turriff, but was soon restored to his congregation by the influence of the earl of Eglinton. Dickson preached on Sundays and week days, and the revival spread to the neighbouring towns of Stewarton and Shotts. The religious enthusiasm received from opponents the name of “the Stewarton sickness,” and its devotees were known as “the daft folk of Stewarton.” The excitement culminated at a communion in Shotts in June 1630, where Dickson was joined by two ministers, Robert Blair and John Livingstone, who, after chequered careers in the north of Ireland, settled in their native country and became leaders in the Presbyterian cause.²

The long-promised visit of king Charles to Scotland was paid in the summer of 1633. He was attended by a numerous retinue of nobles and gentlemen, English and Scottish; and in his train were also Dr. Laud, now bishop of London, and Dr. White, bishop of Ely. The king arrived in Edinburgh on Saturday the 15th June, and next day he attended service in the chapel royal, Holyrood, where the bishop of Dunblane preached. On the Tuesday following the king was crowned with much

¹ Wodrow's *Life of Bruce*, p. 140; M'Crie's *Life of Melville*, ii. 448.

² See Lives of Dickson, Blair, and

Livingstone, edited by the Wodrow Society, and bishop Mant's *Hist. Ch. Ireland*, i. 453.

solemnity in the Abbey Church, by archbishop Spottiswoode. The ceremony concluded with a celebration of the Eucharist, and the king received the communion with marked reverence.¹

Parliament met on the 19th June, and passed many Acts, only two of which affected the Church; the one extending the king's prerogative over all causes spiritual and temporal, the other confirming the government and worship of the Church as it then was in Scotland. The second passed without opposition; the first was opposed by lord Rothes and several other members, who suspected that the king intended to impose not only the surplice but the whole Anglican ritual. On this point Scotsmen of all grades were keenly sensitive, dreading the idea of the nation being reduced to an English province, and the Church becoming a mere pendicle of the Anglican establishment. While the vote was being taken the king was busy marking on a roll of membership the suffrage of each individual. This occupation, peculiar for a king, led to his being afterwards accused, but without satisfactory proof, of falsifying the return. The Clerk-Register declared that the majority was in favour of the Act, but Rothes challenged the return, affirming that it was the other way. Charles answered him that he must make good his challenge under the penalty of treason—a risk which the earl declined to run.²

During the month of June the king attended services

¹ Balfour's *Works*, iii. 199 and iv. 354 *seq.* Balfour was present as lord Lion King-at-Arms.

² *Acts of Parl. Scot.* v. 20, 21; Kirkton's *Hist.* p. 29. Row, *Hist.* p. 367, states that the votes were equal and that the king opposed all inquiry. Burnet, *Hist.* i. 36, 37, asserts that the majority was adverse, and that the king, though aware of

this, forbade the Clerk-Register to be questioned on the subject unless those who challenged the vote were prepared to prove that the return was falsified. Napier, in his *Life of Montrose and the Covenanters*, i. 525, 526, shows that Burnet's version of the story is groundless. See also the *Large Declaration*, p. 12.

both in St. Giles' and in the chapel royal, where the surplice and the English Prayer Book were used. Laud preached in the chapel "upon the benefit of conformity and the reverent ceremonies of the Church, and was received," writes Clarendon, "with all the marks of approbation and applause imaginable."¹ Guthrie, bishop of Moray, wearing his rochet, preached in St. Giles' before the king, and gave much offence to the Edinburgh puritans, who had been accustomed to see him in the black gown when he was one of their city ministers. It was the first act in "the war of the whites," as the contest between surplice and gown came to be called.²

The king, in the beginning of July, extended his journey to Perth, and Dr. Laud paid a visit to the ruined cathedrals of Dunblane and St. Andrews. He remarked that the former was a goodly church, but when a bystander added—"Yes, my lord, this was a brave kirk before the Reformation," the bishop at once corrected him—"What, fellow, Deformation, not Reformation!"³ Charles returned to England in the middle of July, and shortly afterwards, on the death of Dr. Abbot, Laud became archbishop of Canterbury.

A "Humble Supplication" had been prepared by nobles and commissioners for presentation to the king, which referred to the "tacking" together of measures in the late Parliament so as to compel the vote either for the acceptance or rejection of both, and also to the king's attendance and taking notes. It was a delicate subject to handle, but the supplicants did it with due respect, and their petition did not deserve to be described, as it was in the indictment, as a "scandalous, odious, and seditious libel." Rothes was to have presented it to the king at

¹ *History*, i. 147.

² *Spalding's Memorials*, i. 39.

³ *Row's History*, pp. 363, 369.

Dalkeith, but when he spoke of it to Charles, the king warned him of the risk he was running and said testily to the earl—"No more of this, my lord, I command you." Rothés accordingly returned the paper to lord Balmerino, and a year afterwards a copy of it fell into the hands of Spottiswoode, who gave it to the king. The result was that Balmerino was imprisoned, indicted on a charge of "leasing," and tried by a jury, who, by eight votes to seven, pronounced him guilty. He was condemned to death, but popular sympathy ran so strongly in his favour that the royal clemency was extended and Balmerino saved from the scaffold. The whole black business made him the king's relentless enemy to the end.¹ Bishop Burnet, in his *Summary of the Affairs of Scotland*, says that his father attributed the ruin of the king's cause in Scotland in great measure to Balmerino's prosecution.

One of the first acts of Charles after his departure was to issue a warrant directing the bishops to wear their rochets in all church services, and to "sit in their whites" in the Privy Council and Session. The other clergy were ordered to preach in their black gowns, and to use the surplice in all other acts of their office. It was easier for the king to issue mandates in London than it was for Scottish bishops and clergy to execute them in Glasgow or Edinburgh.²

The erection of the bishopric of Edinburgh is due to the visit of Charles to Scotland. The charter, dated the 29th September 1633, narrates that the king, at the request of the archbishop of St. Andrews, had established the new diocese "for the glory of God and the good of His Church in his ancient and native kingdom." The new see comprised the eastern district, from the Forth

¹ *State Trials*, iii. 597, 598, 629; Row's *Hist.* 376, 381.

² *Acts Parl. Scot.* v. 21.

to the Tweed, which was formerly the archdeaconry of Lothian, in the diocese of St. Andrews. St. Giles' was made the cathedral church, and the unseemly partitions, erected fifty years before, to divide nave from chancel into the great and little kirks, were removed.¹ Dr. William Forbes, already mentioned as a former minister in Edinburgh, was nominated by the king to the bishopric. Having preached before Charles with much acceptance, his eloquence and learning decided his promotion. He was consecrated in the chapel royal, Holyrood, in February 1634, but survived his consecration only a short three months. The loss of such a man in those critical times was a great misfortune to the Church, as his counsels might have averted some of the ill-advised proceedings which precipitated the civil war.² Bishop Burnet was no admirer of the ecclesiastical policy of Charles and Laud, and the tribute he pays to the character of bishop Forbes is all the more meritorious. "William Forbes," he writes, "was promoted by the late king while he was in Scotland, who said on good ground that he had found out a bishop that deserved that a see should be made for him. He was a grave and eminent divine; my father that knew him long, and being of counsel for him in his law matters had occasion to know him well, has often told me that he never saw him but he thought his heart was in heaven, and he was never alone with him but he felt within himself a commentary on these words of the Apostle, 'Did not our hearts burn within us while He yet talked with us and opened to us the Scriptures'?"³

¹ Row, in his *History*, p. 370, says of the demolition of the partitions: "Neither ministers nor magistrates in Edinburgh did show tokens of grief and sorrow for this; but many good Christians both in Edinburgh and in the country, did heavily

complain of it to God."

² In Keith's *Catalogue*, pp. 44-60, the charter of erection is given at length. See also Row, pp. 369, 370.

³ Preface to Burnet's *Life of Bishop Bedell and History of his own Times*,

The successor of bishop William Forbes was Dr. Lindsay, translated from the see of Brechin; and Sydserf, dean of Edinburgh, became bishop of Brechin, to be translated in the following year to Galloway. In 1635 died Patrick Forbes, the active and judicious bishop of Aberdeen, a diligent preacher and a wise administrator of his diocese. As chancellor of the University of Aberdeen he was virtually a second founder, raising its reputation, and restoring its fortunes both by personal service and by the selection of learned men for its professors. The primate Spottiswoode lamented him greatly, and wrote to his son, Dr. John Forbes—"Every man can speak of that he hath known and seen; and for myself I speak truth—so wise, judicious, so grave and graceful a pastor I have not known in all my time in any Church."¹

The see of Aberdeen was filled by Adam Bellenden, translated from Dunblane. From a letter of Laud to Bellenden it appears that the bishop had expected to succeed Dr. Forbes in the see of Edinburgh, and that the king, or more probably Laud himself, had passed him over from dissatisfaction with his conduct in a theological dispute on the Atonement, in which bishop Forbes had acted as moderator. Bellenden was cautioned by Laud to be more careful, "lest he gave just occasion to the king to pass him by when any other remove falls." He evidently acted upon the primate's suggestion, and at the next remove he was not passed by.² From the corre-

i. 38. See Life of Bishop William Forbes prefixed to his work, *Considerationes Modeste*; Garden's *Life of Dr. John Forbes*, p. 20, and Gordon's *Scots Affairs*, iii. 235-237; Wodrow's *Biographical Collections*, pp. lxxii. and 245 seq. N.S.C.

¹ *Funerals of Bishop Patrick Forbes*

(Spottiswoode Society), pp. 217, 218.

² Heylin, in his *Life of Laud*, lib. iv. p. 49, says Bellenden was removed from Dunblane for his negligence in the use of the Prayer Book in the chapel royal—he being dean of the chapel.

spondence of Laud with the Scottish bishops, it is easy to understand how difficult it was for them to act with a proper spirit of independence, unless they had been men of heroic mould, and, so far as history shows, the bishops by royal prerogative were not as a body men of that stamp.¹ James Wedderburn, formerly professor of divinity at St. Andrews, and now a prebendary of Ely, succeeded to Dunblane. He had the reputation of scholarship, and along with Maxwell, bishop of Ross, assisted in the compilation of the Scottish Prayer Book, which appeared and disappeared in 1637.²

On the death of the earl of Kinnoul, chancellor of Scotland, archbishop Spottiswoode was elevated to that office in 1635. Apart from the question of the primate's qualifications, the appointment itself was singularly injudicious. No ecclesiastic had held the office since the Reformation, and public opinion had long been adverse to the union of legal and ecclesiastical offices. If a minister of religion had been necessary for the office, probably no man in Scotland had better qualifications for it than Alexander Henderson, minister of Leuchars, "upon whom," says bishop Guthrie,³ "all the ministry of that judgment depended; and no wonder, for in gravity, learning, wisdom, and state policy, he far exceeded any of them." The Presbyterians, however, had consistently forbidden ministers to act as judges in the Court of Session, or as members of Parliament; and the elevation of Spottiswoode naturally deepened their aversion to Episcopacy. The nobility were not less displeased. They were jealous of the prelatie hierarchy; and the recent attempt of the king to recover the bishops' lands, coupled

¹ See Hailes's *Memorials*; and *Letters, Charles I.* 6-16, cited by Burton, vi. 102.

² Row, pp. 375, 388.

³ *Memoirs*, pp. 24, 25.

with his now conferring on the primate an office which belonged, as they thought, to their own order, increased their disaffection to both the Crown and the Church.¹

As the crisis approached which issued in the Great Rebellion, one arbitrary measure followed another in the affairs of the Scottish Church. Charles no doubt acted from higher principles than his father in his advocacy of Episcopacy; but while he had a deeper sense of religion, he had less of the political instinct that knows when to yield to popular feeling. James professed and preferred Episcopacy before he left Scotland, and after his residence in England he strenuously defended it; but still his ecclesiastical policy was largely influenced by political considerations. To his mind Episcopacy was favourable to monarchical government, and Presbytery very much the reverse. Less politic than his father, though a much better man, Charles looked neither to right nor left while pursuing his scheme of levelling up the Scottish Church on a line with the Anglican. Episcopacy was of the essence of his faith, a reverent ritual suited his devotional instinct; and his subjects, so he thought, ought to believe as he believed, and to worship as he worshipped. That was the Tudor idea, and Charles was a Tudor by descent as well as a Stuart. Had he inherited more of the wisdom of the serpent, or been guided by counsellors who possessed it, his hands would have been stayed from the dictatorial and impolitic measures which wrecked Episcopacy in Scotland, and ultimately cost him both his crown and his life.

First came the Book of Canons in 1636, and later in the same year the Ordinal; both being followed next year by the Service Book. The Ordinal, or "Book of Ordination," has dropped out of literature and history, no copy

¹ Balfour, ii. 222; *Original Letters, Reign of James Sixth*, ii. 690.

of it in print being known to exist.¹ The canons soon passed into oblivion, and have little present-day interest except for the antiquary. In the Aberdeen Assembly of 1616 it had been resolved to compile a book of canons from the decrees of former Assemblies and of the early councils ; but the canons of 1636 were a different creation. They were drawn up in nineteen chapters, and in the forefront stood the royal prerogative claiming "the same authority in causes ecclesiastical that the godly kings had amongst the Jews, and Christian emperors in the primitive Church." This was followed by a reference to the Book of Common Prayer, not yet published ; and any one disputing the orthodoxy of this unseen book was liable to excommunication. Deacons and Presbyters—the former being at least twenty-one years of age, and the latter twenty-five—were to be ordained at four prescribed seasons. Divine service was to be performed according to the Book of Common Prayer ; no layman was to administer the sacraments, and the Lord's Supper was to be celebrated four times a year, of which Easter was to be one ; diocesan synods were to be held twice a year, and secret conventicles were forbidden ; no presbyter or preacher was to use extempore prayer under pain of deprivation ; fasts were not to be held without consent of the Ordinary, and never on a Sunday ; each parish was to provide a Bible and Prayer Book, and in each church there was to be a font placed near the door, and a decent table for Holy Communion at the upper end of the chancel, with proper vessels for the celebration ; bishops and clergy without families were at their death to leave their property to the Church, and those who had families were required to leave something to show their goodwill.²

¹ Gordon's *History of Scots Affairs*, ii. 105, note.

² The Bible to be used was what is known as "the Authorised Version"

The contents of the canons are of less historic interest now than the source from which they emanated, and the authority by which they were imposed. They were revised by archbishop Laud, and bishop Juxon of London ; but they were not submitted to any council of the Scottish Church, which was no more consulted than an African tribe would be to-day by a body of foreign missionaries engaged in their conversion. They were issued on the king's sole authority, as much so as if they had been penned by his own hand, and despatched to Scotland by his envoy from Whitehall. In this respect they stand unique among the ecclesiastical laws of Christendom. The English canons of 1604 were no doubt the models of these canons of 1636 ; but the English canons declare in their title that they were "Agreed upon by the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, and published under the Great Seal of England." No such respect was paid to the Scottish Church ; and the bishops were driven into the humiliating position of imposing upon their clergy, and in a measure upon the laity, a code of canons concerning which neither clergy nor laity had ever been consulted. So the national exasperation was deepened until at the next stage it broke out into open revolt.¹

A bishop honoured in his day, and for many years after his death, was Andrew Boyd of Argyll, who died at the close of 1636. Burnet gives the following description of his character, which suggests the reflection that the prelates of that age were not all bishop Boyds: "He

of 1611. It never was authorised in Scotland except by these canons, and so possesses no other authority north of the Tweed than use and wont. The Prayer Book was in preparation, and appeared next year. For the Canons see Grub, ii. 362-368 ; Cook, ii. 358-364.

¹ Contemporary churchmen and

royalists, both English and Scottish, such as Heylin and Gordon, the parson of Rothiemay, alike condemn the unconstitutional way in which the canons were imposed. Heylin's *Life of Laud*, lib. iv. pp. 33-35 (Dublin, 1719), and Gordon's *History Scots Affairs*, ii. 92 (Spalding Club).

found his diocese overrun with ignorance and barbarity, so that in many places the name of Christ was not known ; but he went about that apostolic work of planting the Gospel with a particular industry, and almost with equal success. He got churches and schools to be raised and endowed everywhere, and lived to see a great blessing on his endeavours ; so that he is not so much as named in that country to this day but with a particular veneration, even by those who are otherwise no way equitable to that order. The only answer that our angry people in Scotland used to make, when they were pressed with such instances was, that there were too few of them ; but some of the severest of them have owned to me that if there were many such bishops they would all be Episcopal."¹ The successor to Boyd was Fairley, an Edinburgh minister, and his consecration (8th August 1637) was the last that took place in Scotland until after the Restoration.

Samuel Rutherford, minister of Anwoth in Galloway, got into trouble in 1636 with bishop Sydserf. Rutherford possessed exceptional gifts as preacher and scholar, was highly popular in his district, and of much influence among ladies of rank, with whom he frequently corresponded. In later years he became the favoured son of the Covenant, and is generally regarded as the best representative of its type of piety. His bishop, Sydserf, could not persuade him to submit to the ecclesiastical laws, and he delated him to the High Commission in Edinburgh, which severed him from his southern parish and banished him to Aberdeenshire. Here he found leisure to write to his female friends the remarkable series of letters on religion which have preserved his name more than any of his other works. The letters are of an ecstatic order, and not free from the extravagancies that

¹ Preface to *Life of Bedell*, and Keith's *Catalogue*, p. 291.

have characterised later "revival" literature. In company with Dickson and Henderson (a greater man than either), Rutherford stood in the front rank of the new Presbyterian leaders.¹

Rutherford, from his northern retreat, reports to an Irish correspondent, in the beginning of 1637, the news of the coming Liturgy. "Our Service Book," he writes, "is ordained by open proclamation and sound of trumpet to be read in all the kirks of this kingdom. Our prelates are to meet this month for it and our canons, and for a reconciliation between us and the Lutherans. The professors of Aberdeen are charged to draw up the articles of an uniform confession, but reconciliation with popery is intended."² Baillie takes a more charitable view of this endeavour after union with the Lutherans, and commends the prudence of archbishop Spottiswoode in the negotiations.³

The professors referred to by Rutherford were the famous "Doctors of Aberdeen," who earned a reputation beyond their own country for their remarkable erudition. Foremost "in the oat-fed phalanx" was Dr. John Forbes, second son of bishop Patrick Forbes of Aberdeen, and professor of divinity in King's college of that town; next to him in learning was Dr. Baron, who held the corresponding chair in Marischal college; Dr. Leslie, principal of King's college; Dr. Scroggie, minister of the cathedral church of St. Machar; Dr. Sibbald, minister of St. Nicholas' church, and Dr. Ross his colleague. Dr. Forbes was the author, among other writings, of a work described

¹ Row, pp. 396, 397; *Select Biographies*, Wodrow Soc. i. 320, 321. Rutherford was elected professor of Humanity in Edinburgh University in 1623, and resigned in 1625 on account of some scandal about an

"irregular marriage." See Dalziel's *Hist. of University*, ii. 79, 84.

² Rutherford's *Letters*, p. 362.

³ Baillie, i. 9, 10; *Garden's Life of Dr. John Forbes*, pp. 28, 29.

as an "Irenicum, a peace-offering to all lovers of truth and peace in the Scottish Church." Archbishop Ussher complimented the author as a second Irenæus labouring, like the good bishop of Lyons, to appease strife among brethren. The effort of the Aberdeen doctors to restore concord among the continental Protestants was their last united work, the triumph of the Presbyterians in the Glasgow Assembly of 1638 leading to the breaking up of the northern school of Divinity, and the dispersion of the doctors.¹

¹ Gordon's *Scots Affairs*, iii. 209-236 *passim*; Garden's *Life of Dr.* *John Forbes*, pp. 6-16; Grub, ii. 371-374.

CHAPTER XII

CHARLES I.—YEARS 1637 AND 1638—INTRODUCTION OF LITURGY AND DISESTABLISHMENT OF EPISCO- PACY BY GLASGOW ASSEMBLY

Scottish Church never without a Liturgy—Liturgies before 1637—History of “Laud’s Liturgy”—Its character and contents—Introduction of, in July 1637—Reasons for opposition to—Riot in St. Giles’—The promoters of the riot—The mythical Jenny Geddes—Disturbance in Glasgow over Liturgy—Petitions against the Liturgy—Fresh riot in Edinburgh—The “Tables”—Their action—The National Covenant signed—Criticism of the Covenant—Demands of “Covenanters”—City of Aberdeen and the Covenant—Aberdeen “Doctors” oppose it—King sanctions his father’s Negative Confession—Two intermediary episodes—Preparations for Glasgow Assembly—Aim of Covenanters—Libel against the bishops—Meeting of Assembly in Glasgow Cathedral 1638—Its proceedings—Commissioner dissolves Assembly—It sits notwithstanding, rescinds the Acts of six previous Assemblies, condemns and deposes the bishops, abolishes Episcopacy and requests the king’s approval of its proceedings.

BEFORE entering on the troubled sea of 1637 in which “Laud’s Liturgy” was shipwrecked, the fact may be recalled that Scotland had never been without a Prayer Book in all its ecclesiastical history. The Celtic Liturgy of the first Christian age was succeeded by the Sarum Missal, and the Missal by the English Book of Common Prayer, and Knox’s Book of Common Order. The Assemblies of 1601 and 1616 tried their hands on a revision of Knox’s Book, and Henderson, minister of Leuchars, in vain tried his. Robert Bruce, when in exile

at Inverness, used it in his congregation, and Scrymgeour did the same, as he confessed when indicted before the High Commission in 1620. Bishop Sage relates that many old people he knew remembered its being used by both Presbyterians and Episcopalians after the civil wars.¹

James had resolved upon having a new liturgy in Scotland, and a form of service which has been described as "a cross betwixt the English liturgy and that of Knox," was drafted by his desire, but the opposition to the Perth Articles warned him to proceed no farther in that direction, and the project was dropped.² Charles ventured upon the same enterprise with more zeal and less discretion. It would appear that still another liturgy had been drafted in Scotland and signed by the king 28th September 1634, and after having been altered by Laud and partly printed, was suppressed.³ The issue now raised was, therefore, not between a service book and extempore prayer, but between one book and another, and there is no reason for believing that a liturgy—not perhaps Charles's book and certainly not introduced in Charles's way—but a book better adapted for worship than Knox's, would have proved unacceptable to the majority of the Scottish people.

In the preparatory discussions about the service book the king and Laud were strongly in favour of the Scottish Church adopting the English Prayer Book, that there might be one liturgy and one Church for the three kingdoms. The proposal was plausible, but it made no allowance for national diversities, and it entirely over-

¹ Calderwood, vii. 421; Row's *History*, p. 408; Sage's *Charter of Presbytery*, p. 352.

² Sprott's *Introduction to Scottish Liturgies in Reign of James VI.*,

pp. lxxi. lxxii.

³ *Ibid.* p. lxiii.; Burton, vi. 129, 130; Prynne's *Hidden Works*, p. 156.

looked the jealousy of the Scottish people in their relations to England, "the predominant partner." At last, the king and Laud gave way to the representations of the Scottish prelates in favour of a separate service book.¹ Maxwell and Wedderburn, the bishops of Ross and Dunblane, were entrusted with the drafting of the liturgy, and it was then submitted for revision to archbishop Laud, Juxon, bishop of London, and Wren, bishop of Norwich. Laud stated honestly how much opposed he was to a separate liturgy, but having yielded the point he gave all the help that he could in its compilation. This is very true, and the Service Book, where it differs from the English Prayer Book, chiefly in the Communion Office, bears so unmistakably the impress of Laud's hand that the popular description of it as "Laud's liturgy" is by no means inaccurate.²

The representations of the liturgy, still current in some quarters, as the Anglican liturgy tinctured with a strong flavour of popery, proceed from an inveterate confusion between what is Catholic and what is Roman, and from want of familiarity with the liturgies of the Primitive Church. Dean Stanley maintains³ that the structure of the Communion Office of 1637, which has been specially charged with Roman teaching, places it and the American Prayer Book, "contrary to the usual opinion entertained of them . . ., in the foremost rank of Protestant forms of devotion."⁴ Protestant it certainly was against Roman error, and yet distinctively Catholic in its teaching of primitive truth. In the calendar were inserted by the king's desire the names of several Celtic and Scottish saints,—David, Kentigern, Colman, Gilbert,

¹ Heylin, *Life of Laud*, lib. iv. p. 49, "the book being first hammered and prepared in Scotland."

² Sprott in his *Liturgies of James*

Sixth's Reign has made this clear.

³ *Christian Institutions*, p. 76.

⁴ See also, Stanley's *Church of Scotland*, p. 43.

at Inverness, used it in his congregation, and Scrymgeour did the same, as he confessed when indicted before the High Commission in 1620. Bishop Sage relates that many old people he knew remembered its being used by both Presbyterians and Episcopalians after the civil wars.¹

James had resolved upon having a new liturgy in Scotland, and a form of service which has been described as "a cross betwixt the English liturgy and that of Knox," was drafted by his desire, but the opposition to the Perth Articles warned him to proceed no farther in that direction, and the project was dropped.² Charles ventured upon the same enterprise with more zeal and less discretion. It would appear that still another liturgy had been drafted in Scotland and signed by the king 28th September 1634, and after having been altered by Laud and partly printed, was suppressed.³ The issue now raised was, therefore, not between a service book and extempore prayer, but between one book and another, and there is no reason for believing that a liturgy—not perhaps Charles's book and certainly not introduced in Charles's way—but a book better adapted for worship than Knox's, would have proved unacceptable to the majority of the Scottish people.

In the preparatory discussions about the service book the king and Laud were strongly in favour of the Scottish Church adopting the English Prayer Book, that there might be one liturgy and one Church for the three kingdoms. The proposal was plausible, but it made no allowance for national diversities, and it entirely over-

¹ Calderwood, vii. 421; Row's *History*, p. 408; Sage's *Charter of Presbytery*, p. 352.

² Sprott's *Introduction to Scottish Liturgies in Reign of James VI.*,

pp. lxxi. lxxii.

³ *Ibid.* p. lxiii.; Burton, vi. 129, 130; Prynne's *Hidden Works*, p. 156.

looked the jealousy of the Scottish people in their relations to England, "the predominant partner." At last, the king and Laud gave way to the representations of the Scottish prelates in favour of a separate service book.¹ Maxwell and Wedderburn, the bishops of Ross and Dunblane, were entrusted with the drafting of the liturgy, and it was then submitted for revision to archbishop Laud, Juxon, bishop of London, and Wren, bishop of Norwich. Laud stated honestly how much opposed he was to a separate liturgy, but having yielded the point he gave all the help that he could in its compilation. This is very true, and the Service Book, where it differs from the English Prayer Book, chiefly in the Communion Office, bears so unmistakably the impress of Laud's hand that the popular description of it as "Laud's liturgy" is by no means inaccurate.²

The representations of the liturgy, still current in some quarters, as the Anglican liturgy tinctured with a strong flavour of popery, proceed from an inveterate confusion between what is Catholic and what is Roman, and from want of familiarity with the liturgies of the Primitive Church. Dean Stanley maintains³ that the structure of the Communion Office of 1637, which has been specially charged with Roman teaching, places it and the American Prayer Book, "contrary to the usual opinion entertained of them . . ., in the foremost rank of Protestant forms of devotion."⁴ Protestant it certainly was against Roman error, and yet distinctively Catholic in its teaching of primitive truth. In the calendar were inserted by the king's desire the names of several Celtic and Scottish saints,—David, Kentigern, Colman, Gilbert,

¹ Heylin, *Life of Laud*, lib. iv. p. 49, "the book being first hammered and prepared in Scotland."

² Sprott in his *Liturgies of James*

Sixth's Reign has made this clear.

³ *Christian Institutions*, p. 76.

⁴ See also, Stanley's *Church of Scotland*, p. 43.

at Inverness, used it in his congregation, and Scrymgeour did the same, as he confessed when indicted before the High Commission in 1620. Bishop Sage relates that many old people he knew remembered its being used by both Presbyterians and Episcopalians after the civil wars.¹

James had resolved upon having a new liturgy in Scotland, and a form of service which has been described as "a cross betwixt the English liturgy and that of Knox," was drafted by his desire, but the opposition to the Perth Articles warned him to proceed no farther in that direction, and the project was dropped.² Charles ventured upon the same enterprise with more zeal and less discretion. It would appear that still another liturgy had been drafted in Scotland and signed by the king 28th September 1634, and after having been altered by Laud and partly printed, was suppressed.³ The issue now raised was, therefore, not between a service book and extempore prayer, but between one book and another, and there is no reason for believing that a liturgy—not perhaps Charles's book and certainly not introduced in Charles's way—but a book better adapted for worship than Knox's, would have proved unacceptable to the majority of the Scottish people.

In the preparatory discussions about the service book the king and Laud were strongly in favour of the Scottish Church adopting the English Prayer Book, that there might be one liturgy and one Church for the three kingdoms. The proposal was plausible, but it made no allowance for national diversities, and it entirely over-

¹ Calderwood, vii. 421; Row's *History*, p. 408; Sage's *Charter of Presbytery*, p. 352.

² Sprott's *Introduction to Scottish Liturgies in Reign of James VI.*,

pp. lxxi. lxxii.

³ *Ibid.* p. lxiii.; Burton, vi. 129, 130; Prynne's *Hidden Works*, p. 156.

looked the jealousy of the Scottish people in their relations to England, "the predominant partner." At last, the king and Laud gave way to the representations of the Scottish prelates in favour of a separate service book.¹ Maxwell and Wedderburn, the bishops of Ross and Dunblane, were entrusted with the drafting of the liturgy, and it was then submitted for revision to archbishop Laud, Juxon, bishop of London, and Wren, bishop of Norwich. Laud stated honestly how much opposed he was to a separate liturgy, but having yielded the point he gave all the help that he could in its compilation. This is very true, and the Service Book, where it differs from the English Prayer Book, chiefly in the Communion Office, bears so unmistakably the impress of Laud's hand that the popular description of it as "Laud's liturgy" is by no means inaccurate.²

The representations of the liturgy, still current in some quarters, as the Anglican liturgy tinctured with a strong flavour of popery, proceed from an inveterate confusion between what is Catholic and what is Roman, and from want of familiarity with the liturgies of the Primitive Church. Dean Stanley maintains³ that the structure of the Communion Office of 1637, which has been specially charged with Roman teaching, places it and the American Prayer Book, "contrary to the usual opinion entertained of them . . ., in the foremost rank of Protestant forms of devotion."⁴ Protestant it certainly was against Roman error, and yet distinctively Catholic in its teaching of primitive truth. In the calendar were inserted by the king's desire the names of several Celtic and Scottish saints,—David, Kentigern, Colman, Gilbert,

¹ Heylin, *Life of Laud*, lib. iv. p. 49, "the book being first hammered and prepared in Scotland."

² Sprott in his *Liturgies of James*

Sixth's Reign has made this clear.

³ *Christian Institutions*, p. 76.

⁴ See also, Stanley's *Church of Scotland*, p. 43.

at Inverness, used it in his congregation, and Scrymgeour did the same, as he confessed when indicted before the High Commission in 1620. Bishop Sage relates that many old people he knew remembered its being used by both Presbyterians and Episcopalians after the civil wars.¹

James had resolved upon having a new liturgy in Scotland, and a form of service which has been described as "a cross betwixt the English liturgy and that of Knox," was drafted by his desire, but the opposition to the Perth Articles warned him to proceed no farther in that direction, and the project was dropped.² Charles ventured upon the same enterprise with more zeal and less discretion. It would appear that still another liturgy had been drafted in Scotland and signed by the king 28th September 1634, and after having been altered by Laud and partly printed, was suppressed.³ The issue now raised was, therefore, not between a service book and extempore prayer, but between one book and another, and there is no reason for believing that a liturgy—not perhaps Charles's book and certainly not introduced in Charles's way—but a book better adapted for worship than Knox's, would have proved unacceptable to the majority of the Scottish people.

In the preparatory discussions about the service book the king and Laud were strongly in favour of the Scottish Church adopting the English Prayer Book, that there might be one liturgy and one Church for the three kingdoms. The proposal was plausible, but it made no allowance for national diversities, and it entirely over-

¹ Calderwood, vii. 421; Row's *History*, p. 408; Sage's *Charter of Presbytery*, p. 352.

² Sprott's *Introduction to Scottish Liturgies in Reign of James VI.*,

pp. lxxi. lxxii.

³ *Ibid.* p. lxiii.; Burton, vi. 129, 130; Prynne's *Hidden Works*, p. 156.

looked the jealousy of the Scottish people in their relations to England, "the predominant partner." At last, the king and Laud gave way to the representations of the Scottish prelates in favour of a separate service book.¹ Maxwell and Wedderburn, the bishops of Ross and Dunblane, were entrusted with the drafting of the liturgy, and it was then submitted for revision to archbishop Laud, Juxon, bishop of London, and Wren, bishop of Norwich. Laud stated honestly how much opposed he was to a separate liturgy, but having yielded the point he gave all the help that he could in its compilation. This is very true, and the Service Book, where it differs from the English Prayer Book, chiefly in the Communion Office, bears so unmistakably the impress of Laud's hand that the popular description of it as "Laud's liturgy" is by no means inaccurate.²

The representations of the liturgy, still current in some quarters, as the Anglican liturgy tintured with a strong flavour of popery, proceed from an inveterate confusion between what is Catholic and what is Roman, and from want of familiarity with the liturgies of the Primitive Church. Dean Stanley maintains³ that the structure of the Communion Office of 1637, which has been specially charged with Roman teaching, places it and the American Prayer Book, "contrary to the usual opinion entertained of them . . ., in the foremost rank of Protestant forms of devotion."⁴ Protestant it certainly was against Roman error, and yet distinctively Catholic in its teaching of primitive truth. In the calendar were inserted by the king's desire the names of several Celtic and Scottish saints,—David, Kentigern, Colman, Gilbert,

¹ Heylin, *Life of Laud*, lib. iv. p. 49, "the book being first hammered and prepared in Scotland."

² Spratt in his *Liturgies of James*

Sixth's Reign has made this clear.

³ *Christian Institutions*, p. 76.

⁴ See also, Stanley's *Church of Scotland*, p. 43.

at Inverness, used it in his congregation, and Scrymgeour did the same, as he confessed when indicted before the High Commission in 1620. Bishop Sage relates that many old people he knew remembered its being used by both Presbyterians and Episcopalians after the civil wars.¹

James had resolved upon having a new liturgy in Scotland, and a form of service which has been described as "a cross betwixt the English liturgy and that of Knox," was drafted by his desire, but the opposition to the Perth Articles warned him to proceed no farther in that direction, and the project was dropped.² Charles ventured upon the same enterprise with more zeal and less discretion. It would appear that still another liturgy had been drafted in Scotland and signed by the king 28th September 1634, and after having been altered by Laud and partly printed, was suppressed.³ The issue now raised was, therefore, not between a service book and extempore prayer, but between one book and another, and there is no reason for believing that a liturgy—not perhaps Charles's book and certainly not introduced in Charles's way—but a book better adapted for worship than Knox's, would have proved unacceptable to the majority of the Scottish people.

In the preparatory discussions about the service book the king and Laud were strongly in favour of the Scottish Church adopting the English Prayer Book, that there might be one liturgy and one Church for the three kingdoms. The proposal was plausible, but it made no allowance for national diversities, and it entirely over-

¹ Calderwood, vii. 421; Row's *History*, p. 408; Sage's *Charter of Presbytery*, p. 352.

² Sprott's *Introduction to Scottish Liturgies in Reign of James VI.*,

pp. lxxi. lxxii.

³ *Ibid.* p. lxiii.; Burton, vi. 129, 130; Prynne's *Hidden Works*, p. 156.

looked the jealousy of the Scottish people in their relations to England, "the predominant partner." At last, the king and Laud gave way to the representations of the Scottish prelates in favour of a separate service book.¹ Maxwell and Wedderburn, the bishops of Ross and Dunblane, were entrusted with the drafting of the liturgy, and it was then submitted for revision to archbishop Laud, Juxon, bishop of London, and Wren, bishop of Norwich. Laud stated honestly how much opposed he was to a separate liturgy, but having yielded the point he gave all the help that he could in its compilation. This is very true, and the Service Book, where it differs from the English Prayer Book, chiefly in the Communion Office, bears so unmistakably the impress of Laud's hand that the popular description of it as "Laud's liturgy" is by no means inaccurate.²

The representations of the liturgy, still current in some quarters, as the Anglican liturgy tintured with a strong flavour of popery, proceed from an inveterate confusion between what is Catholic and what is Roman, and from want of familiarity with the liturgies of the Primitive Church. Dean Stanley maintains³ that the structure of the Communion Office of 1637, which has been specially charged with Roman teaching, places it and the American Prayer Book, "contrary to the usual opinion entertained of them . . ., in the foremost rank of Protestant forms of devotion."⁴ Protestant it certainly was against Roman error, and yet distinctively Catholic in its teaching of primitive truth. In the calendar were inserted by the king's desire the names of several Celtic and Scottish saints,—David, Kentigern, Colman, Gilbert,

¹ Heylin, *Life of Laud*, lib. iv. p. 49, "the book being first hammered and prepared in Scotland."

² Spratt in his *Liturgies of James*

Sixth's Reign has made this clear.

³ *Christian Institutions*, p. 76.

⁴ See also, Stanley's *Church of Scotland*, p. 43.

at Inverness, used it in his congregation, and Scrymgeour did the same, as he confessed when indicted before the High Commission in 1620. Bishop Sage relates that many old people he knew remembered its being used by both Presbyterians and Episcopalians after the civil wars.¹

James had resolved upon having a new liturgy in Scotland, and a form of service which has been described as "a cross betwixt the English liturgy and that of Knox," was drafted by his desire, but the opposition to the Perth Articles warned him to proceed no farther in that direction, and the project was dropped.² Charles ventured upon the same enterprise with more zeal and less discretion. It would appear that still another liturgy had been drafted in Scotland and signed by the king 28th September 1634, and after having been altered by Laud and partly printed, was suppressed.³ The issue now raised was, therefore, not between a service book and extempore prayer, but between one book and another, and there is no reason for believing that a liturgy—not perhaps Charles's book and certainly not introduced in Charles's way—but a book better adapted for worship than Knox's, would have proved unacceptable to the majority of the Scottish people.

In the preparatory discussions about the service book the king and Laud were strongly in favour of the Scottish Church adopting the English Prayer Book, that there might be one liturgy and one Church for the three kingdoms. The proposal was plausible, but it made no allowance for national diversities, and it entirely over-

¹ Calderwood, vii. 421; Row's *History*, p. 408; Sage's *Charter of Presbytery*, p. 352.

² Sprott's *Introduction to Scottish Liturgies in Reign of James VI.*,

pp. lxxi. lxxii.

³ *Ibid.* p. lxiii.; Burton, vi. 129, 130; Prynne's *Hidden Works*, p. 156.

looked the jealousy of the Scottish people in their relations to England, "the predominant partner." At last, the king and Laud gave way to the representations of the Scottish prelates in favour of a separate service book.¹ Maxwell and Wedderburn, the bishops of Ross and Dunblane, were entrusted with the drafting of the liturgy, and it was then submitted for revision to archbishop Laud, Juxon, bishop of London, and Wren, bishop of Norwich. Laud stated honestly how much opposed he was to a separate liturgy, but having yielded the point he gave all the help that he could in its compilation. This is very true, and the Service Book, where it differs from the English Prayer Book, chiefly in the Communion Office, bears so unmistakably the impress of Laud's hand that the popular description of it as "Laud's liturgy" is by no means inaccurate.²

The representations of the liturgy, still current in some quarters, as the Anglican liturgy tinged with a strong flavour of popery, proceed from an inveterate confusion between what is Catholic and what is Roman, and from want of familiarity with the liturgies of the Primitive Church. Dean Stanley maintains³ that the structure of the Communion Office of 1637, which has been specially charged with Roman teaching, places it and the American Prayer Book, "contrary to the usual opinion entertained of them . . ., in the foremost rank of Protestant forms of devotion."⁴ Protestant it certainly was against Roman error, and yet distinctively Catholic in its teaching of primitive truth. In the calendar were inserted by the king's desire the names of several Celtic and Scottish saints,—David, Kentigern, Colman, Gilbert,

¹ Heylin, *Life of Laud*, lib. iv. p. 49, "the book being first hammered and prepared in Scotland."

² Spratt in his *Liturgies of James*

Sixth's Reign has made this clear.

³ *Christian Institutions*, p. 76.

⁴ See also, Stanley's *Church of Scotland*, p. 43.

Columba, Palladius, Ninian, Adamnan, queen Margaret of Scotland, and not omitting, said the king, St. George the patron of England, and St. Patrick of Ireland.¹ The lessons from the Apocrypha were limited to a few chapters from the books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus. The sentences from the Apocrypha disappear from the offertory, and in Morning Prayer the twenty-third Psalm is substituted for the Benedicite. In the Eucharistic Office, or Liturgy proper, the word Presbyter (Adamnan's name for the celebrant in the days of St. Columba) is invariably used. There is a fuller commemoration of the faithful departed in the Church Militant prayer than in the English Liturgy, and both the Invocation and Oblation find a place in the Office. In the administration of the sacrament only the first part of the sentence addressed to the communicant in the English Book was directed to be used, as was the case in the First Book of Edward VI.

Probably the most offensive part of the service book was the royal proclamation, dated 20th December 1636, printed at the beginning, and commanded to be read by the civil officers of State at the market crosses of all the burgh towns in Scotland. Such a method of introducing a national Liturgy into a national Church was unknown in history, and was more likely to form a warning than a precedent. Charles and his adviser Laud were alike infatuated, but there is reason to suspect that they were encouraged by the sinister advice of political leaders in Scotland, who could foresee that a crisis was impending, and who were not above using this device to accelerate it.² Guthrie reports that the bishops were a house divided against itself, the younger urging the introduction of the Liturgy, the elder advocating delay and some regard

¹ Heylin, p. 50.

² Burton, vi. 146.

to constitutional methods of procedure.¹ This is very doubtful. What is more certain is that the noblemen, who afterwards figured as leaders in the rebellion, were working on opposite lines from the bishops and aiming at the overthrow of the episcopal order. How far the bishops unconsciously strengthened their hands by their unwisdom, and by the prelatic ambition of which they were freely accused, it is impossible now to say. Probably in the eyes of their accusers the worst fault of some of them was that they were bishops.

The service book was to have been introduced at Easter 1637, but for some reason not explained it was withheld until July. Intimation was made in the several churches of Edinburgh on Sunday the 16th July that the liturgy would be used on the following Sunday, the Seventh after Trinity. To give *ecclât* to the occasion, the two archbishops, the bishop of Edinburgh, and other prelates, with the lords of the Privy Council, the judges of the supreme court, and the magistrates of the city, attended the cathedral church of St. Giles. The service from Knox's Book had been used at an earlier hour; but no sooner had dean Hannay, vested in surplice, begun the new liturgy than a clamour arose in the congregation, which increased as the dean proceeded and ended in open disorder and acts of violence. Books and other missiles were thrown, and when the bishop of Edinburgh, who was to preach, went into the pulpit to rebuke the disturbers and restore order, he was assailed with a stool which narrowly missed his head. At this stage the magistrates interfered, and cleared the church of the rioters, after which the service proceeded without further interruption. In the afternoon precautions were taken against the admission of the mob, and nothing unusual happened. Lindsay, the bishop of

¹ *Memoirs of Bishop Guthrie*, pp. 14-19.

Edinburgh, was attacked by the rabble in the streets at the close of both services, and was rescued with difficulty from serious maltreatment. So began and ended in St. Giles' the attempt, rashly undertaken and as hastily abandoned, to impose a liturgy upon a nation without its consent.¹

It is doubtful who were the instigators of the riots in St. Giles'. Bishop Guthrie² says they were the result of a consultation at Edinburgh in April between the ministers, Henderson and Dickson, together with lord Balmerino and Sir Thomas Hope, the lord advocate. The combination, he says, included several ladies, whom he names, and they are described by a second writer as "the devouter sex."³ Another contemporary gives the following version of the scene: "A number of the meaner sort of the people, most of them waiting-maids and women who use in that town for to keep places for the better sort, with clapping of their hands, curses, and outcries, raised such an uncouth noise and hubbub in the church that not any one could either hear or be heard."⁴ Dr. Burton concurs in this view and says—"Some of them (the women), no doubt, were zealots; but the bulk of those contributing outcry and violence were creatures of that debased mob-element, with animal instincts, ever tending to abuse and violence when they are excited."⁵

No narrative of the riot in St. Giles' would perhaps be complete without some reference to the mythical Jenny Geddes of 1637, whom certain modern writers have manufactured into a historical personage, and lauded

¹ Guthrie's *Memoirs*, p. 20; Baillie's *Letters*, i. 18; Gordon, *History of Scots Affairs*, i. 8; *Large Declaration*, pp. 23, 26; Row's *History*, pp. 408, 409; Clarendon's *History*, i. 87, 88.

² *Memoirs*, p. 23.

³ Guthrie was deposed from the

ministry by the Covenanters for "malignancy" in 1648, and became bishop of Dunkeld in 1664.—Keith's *Catalogue*, p. 99.

⁴ Gordon's *History of Scots Affairs*, i. 7.

⁵ *History*, vi. 150

as a heroine. The only historical Janet Geddes figured in the High Street of Edinburgh at the Restoration of Charles II. in 1661 as a staunch royalist, and Burton shows how, in the next century, her name became erroneously associated with the riot in St. Giles' church.¹

Disturbances of a less violent character were raised in other churches on the reading of the liturgy. In Greyfriars', Edinburgh, Fairley, the bishop-elect of Argyll, had to give up reading the service before he had well begun. The Privy Council by proclamation denounced the rioters; the magistrates of Edinburgh made a submissive apology to the king, and apprehended several suspected persons. Spottiswoode, the chancellor, in the name of himself and the other bishops, suspended the reading both of the old and new service books, permitting only the Sunday sermons with extempore prayers preceding and following. The suspension of Knox's Book is difficult to explain, unless it were done from episcopal pique. It gave much dissatisfaction to both the king and Laud; but Baillie exaggerates the evil when he describes Edinburgh as being under a religious interdict, seeing that the people had on Sundays unlimited sermons and prayers from their ministers.²

The king wrote to the Privy Council in the end of July, and the Council, taking courage from his letter, agreed to resume the use of the liturgy on the 13th

¹ Burton, vi. note, 151, 152. Chambers, in his *Domestic Annals*, iii. 593, states that in 1735 there was living in Edinburgh a middle-aged man named Robert Main who boasted that the woman usually called Jenny Geddes, but really Barbara Hamilton, who threw the stool, was his great-grandmother. A descendant of dean Hannay has been indiscreetly allowed to erect in St. Giles' a brass tablet to his ancestor's memory, for no apparent

reason except that he was dean at that memorable crisis. This has quite naturally provoked a counter memorial of the fame of Jenny Geddes. Only there is this difference between the records on the twin tablets,—that the commemorated dean was really a personage in the incident recorded, while the monumental Jenny is a myth.

² Baillie's *Letters*, i. 18.

August ; but when the day came no liturgy appeared. The bishops and the lay members of Council had fallen out, each side throwing the blame of the riots on the other ; the bishops accusing the lay lords of culpable indifference, and the lords blaming the bishops for fatuous bungling. The earl of Traquair, the treasurer, though specially trusted by Laud, seems to have been unworthy of his confidence, and is considered by many to have been the marplot of the service book.

Archbishop Lindsay was not more successful with the liturgy in Glasgow than his namesake, bishop Lindsay, had been in Edinburgh. He had asked Baillie, a moderate man, who at first was in favour of Episcopal government though opposed to the liturgy, and still more to the manner of its introduction, to preach at his diocesan synod in August. When Baillie refused, William Annand, minister of Ayr, was appointed ; and, according to Baillie, he defended the liturgy in his sermon as well as any man in Britain could have done.¹ His pulpit utterances drew upon him some rough handling from the female puritans of Glasgow, who mobbed and attacked him in the streets to the danger of his life, until the magistrates had to give him a safe conduct and send him out of the city.²

The excitement in Edinburgh was zealously fanned by the Presbyterians. Petitioners against the liturgy flocked into the capital, and so active was the canvass throughout the country that in a short time sixty-eight petitions were presented to the Council. They were handed to the duke of Lennox, who was passing through Edinburgh to London, that he might present them to his majesty. When the royal answer came on the 17th October, the mixed multitude that had assembled were surprised by a proclamation forbidding the Council from

¹ Baillie's *Letters*, i. 19-21.

² Rothes, *Relation*, pp. 2-5.

further meddling with ecclesiastical affairs, ordering all strangers to leave Edinburgh within twenty-four hours, removing the Courts of Justice to Linlithgow, and commanding that the book entitled *A Dispute against the English Popish Ceremonies obtruded upon the Church of Scotland*¹ should be brought to the Council and publicly burned.²

The populace, however, were no longer to be awed by royal proclamations, and next day they proceeded to the most violent outrages. Bishop Sydserf became a victim of the popular fury, being specially obnoxious from his high church proclivities and from the common belief that somewhere about him he wore a crucifix. He was attacked in the street by a mob, in which women as usual predominated; and they would probably have torn him to pieces but for his escape into the Council-room. When this refuge was assailed by the rioters a messenger was sent to the magistrates for help, but they were in the same state of siege. Traquair, the lord treasurer, ventured into the streets to appease the crowd, and a rush was made upon him in which he was thrown down and his hat and cloak and white wand of office trampled on the ground. The magistrates could not pacify the mob, and had ultimately to appeal to the nobles, who were known to be on friendly terms with the ringleaders. Baillie describes the situation as follows: "There was never in our land such an appearance of a stir: the whole people think popery at the doors; the scandalous pamphlets which come daily new from England, add oil to this flame; no man may speak anything in public for the king's part, except he would have himself marked for a sacrifice to be killed one

¹ Written by young Gillespie, afterwards a member of the Westminster Assembly.

² Guthrie's *Memoirs*, p. 24; *The*

Large Declaration, pp. 33, 34; *Peterkin's Records*, p. 55; Balfour, ii. 236.

day. I think our people possessed with a bloody devil, far above anything that I ever could have imagined, though the Mass in Latin had been presented.”¹

The Privy Council issued a proclamation next day forbidding the citizens to assemble in the streets, but the citizens were now backed by a power stronger than the Council, and defied it. The agitation was kept alive. A petition was presented to Spottiswoode, the chancellor, in the name of “the men, women, children, and servants of Edinburgh,” protesting against the service book; and another to the same effect came from the nobles, barons, ministers, burgesses, and commons of the kingdom. More than the service book was aimed at in these protestations. The reforming lords, who were the backbone of the opposition, were determined to overthrow the episcopal hierarchy, as the surest means of circumventing their lordly rivals and of retaining possession of the Church lands, which formed the chief wealth of many of them. They met in Edinburgh on the 15th November, and among them for the first time appeared the young earl of Montrose, who was afterwards to win his fame in other fields and in different company. To strengthen their position against the Government they combined with the other classes of the people, and formed four representative committees of nobles, gentry, ministers, and burgesses. As these committees sat at four different tables in the Parliament-house, they came to be known as THE TABLES. A few noblemen, Rothes, Balmerino, and Loudon, with the two ministers, Henderson and Dickson, whom Baillie calls “the two archbishops,” were the soul of the new movement. The Privy Council with some hesitation consented to the formation of the “Tables,” and by this grave blunder unwittingly undermined its own authority.² The Tables were at first sanctioned to receive

¹ *Letters*, etc. i. 10.

² Burton, vi. 170.

the petitions of the people and advise them ; but very soon they were strong enough to issue mandates in their own name, which were more respected than the proclamations of king or Council. Dr. Cunningham remarks that "they (the Tables) soon assumed all the powers which were possessed by the Clubs of Paris during the French Revolution."¹ The comparison is as candid now as the tabular institution was ominous then. Here were men, nobles and ministers, loudly protesting against the king's violation of the constitution, and yet at the very outset of their opposition subverting the first principles of the constitution and usurping the government of the country.

Charles by way of conciliation had sent the earl of Roxburgh with a proclamation, made at Linlithgow 7th December 1637, in which he declared his abhorrence of popery and his resolve to maintain the goodly laws of his native kingdom. The Tables answered by sending deputies to the Privy Council at Dalkeith, on the 24th December, to demand that the bishops, as the prime movers of all the mischief, should be removed from their seats at the Council-board. This was more than the Council could do—to change its own constitution—and the matter was remitted to Whitehall.²

At the king's request Traquair, the treasurer, went to London to consult with his Majesty, who was still incredulous that the country stood on the verge of revolution. After much consultation, in which both Laud and Strafford took part, it was determined to stand by the service book.³ Traquair returned to Scotland with his instructions and proclaimed them at Stirling, where the Council and the Sessions were then held, on the 19th February 1638.

¹ *Hist. Ch. Scot.* ii. 78.

² *Large Declaration*, pp. 45-47 ;
Baillie, i. pp. 25-27, 42-46 and

454-458.

³ Nothing came of this unwise resolution.

Some of the lords of the Tables were in Stirling before him, and when he had read the royal proclamation at the market cross, which severely censured the petitioners and commanded strangers to leave the town, lords Lindsay and Home stood up and read a protest in which they maintained their right to petition the king, and declared their opposition to prelates sitting as judges in any court, civil or ecclesiastical ; at the same time repudiating all responsibility for the consequences of their action. Similar scenes followed at Linlithgow and Edinburgh ; and in the capital the proclamation was received "with jeering and laughter of the most unmannerly sort" on the part of the crowd, amongst whom were mingled lords and barons and ministers, the active agents of the Tables.¹

The country was, in truth, on the brink of revolution, and the next step taken by the Tables precipitated the crisis. The Scottish nobles had for centuries been adepts in the formation of "bonds" for joint action in resistance to the Crown, and the old expedient was adopted now. But the new bond was to have a broader basis than earlier precedents supplied. The classes and the masses were to be welded together for more formidable resistance to the Government. Scotland must be leagued in covenant, and prepared for it by a solemn fast, during which every available pulpit was to ring with the wrongs of the people. It was done. The National Covenant of 1638 appeared. It consisted of three parts, the first being a repetition of James the Sixth's Negative Confession of 1581 ; the second, a rehearsal of various Acts of Parliament against popery and in favour of the Reformed religion ; and the third, the Covenant proper, in which the subscribers bound themselves to defend the Protestant religion, to abjure all innovations and corruptions of the same, and to stand by

¹ *Large Declaration*, pp. 47-52 ; *Roth's Relation*, pp. 59-68.

each other in defence of their religious freedom against all persons whatsoever.¹ Johnstone of Warriston is credited with preparing the second part, and Henderson, the third. When the draft was submitted to the committees considerable opposition was made to portions of it. Some objected to the condemnation of the Perth Articles on the ground that they had been passed in a lawful Assembly; ministers said that the signing of the Covenant would be perjury to their ordination vows; and others, taking a wider view, declared the Covenant to be veiled treason. By judicious alterations the scruples of objectors were overcome, and preparations made for signing the Covenant on a national scale.

In the Old Greyfriars' church, Edinburgh, the signing began on the 28th February 1638. It was prefaced by a prayer from Henderson, and a speech from Loudon. The aged earl of Sutherland was the first to sign, and soon the parchment was well covered with names of persons of all ranks and of both sexes. It was taken from the church to the churchyard, and subscribed by many of the people on a flat gravestone. The signing continued for four hours until eight in the evening.² Most of the signatures appear written in black and a few in red, which gave rise to the tradition that it was signed in blood; some sign only their initials, and a few add "till death." The bold signature of "Montrose" stands prominent in the list.³

Copies of the Covenant were immediately distributed throughout the country, and signed by thousands with the greatest enthusiasm. The Tables had organised a staff to complete the work, and their agents were busy in every parish. It did not, however, meet with universal

¹ Peterkin's *Records of the Kirk*, pp. 9-13.

² Rothes's *Relation*, pp. 70-79.

³ *The Covenants and the Covenanters*, by Rev. Dr. Kerr, Glasgow, 1895.

acceptance. The Universities of St. Andrews and Aberdeen condemned it; Dr. Strang, the principal of Glasgow University, and the famous Zachary Boyd, refused to subscribe it. Opposition was offered in other quarters, especially in Aberdeen, where the citizens were all but unanimous against it; but so popular was the movement elsewhere, and so determined the zeal of the "Covenanters," as they were now called, that many were constrained to sign it for the sake of peace, aware that the Government was powerless to protect them.¹

Different views are held of the Covenant, now as then; but it is difficult to defend it on grounds of legality. Its subscribers were loud in their professions of loyalty to the throne, but their professions have to be read in the light of their subsequent action, which was perfectly consistent with the spirit of the Covenant but hardly so with any recognised standard of loyalty; and if they meant open war it would have been more honest to have said so. It is certain that the continental Reformers did not sympathise with the belligerent attitude of the Covenanters. Dr. Cunningham says of the Covenant—"If we interpret it as the Covenanters themselves did, when they afterwards took up arms against their king for their mutual defence, it is difficult to understand how law should sanction such a league."² The Covenant was virtually a summons to arms—whether justifiable or not is a question which will be variously answered. Spottiswoode, the archbishop, when he heard of the scene at Greyfriars is said to have exclaimed, "They have thrown down in a day what we have been building up for thirty years." And so they had.

¹ *Large Declaration*, pp. 72, 73; Baillie, i. 52, 53; Stevenson, *Hist. Ch. and State of Scotland*, ii. 298; Rothes's *Relation*, pp. 70-80;

Gordon's *Scots Affairs*, i. 43, 44; Burton, vi. 204, 205.

² *Hist. Ch. Scot.* ii. 84.

Charles was at once apprised of the inflammatory state of the country. Despatches were sent to London, the chief officers of State followed, and several of the bishops were already there. Livingstone, the minister, was sent by the Covenanters with copies of the Covenant to their English confederates. He rode disguised in a gray coat and Montero cap, and on the way was thrown from his horse and so much disfigured that on his arrival he could not appear among his friends. Several English noblemen visited and held counsel with him, but before many days he was warned, through the marquis of Hamilton, that the king was aware of his presence in London and had threatened to put fetters on his feet. Livingstone acted on the warning and was soon back among his friends in Scotland.¹

As a result of a conference with the king, the marquis of Hamilton was sent in the end of May as commissioner to treat with the Covenanters. On the 28th April they had forwarded to the Scottish lords at Court a statement of their grievances, signed by the earls of Rothes, Cassillis, and Montrose, in which they insisted upon the abolition of the court of High Commission, as well as of the service book and canons. When Hamilton arrived at Dalkeith in June he found that the demands of the Covenanters were rising with the success of their cause, and he hesitated to publish the king's proclamation, certain as it was to be followed by a protest, unless he had the means of enforcing it. The Covenanters, forecasting the probable issue, had ordered arms from the Continent, and had surrounded Edinburgh Castle with a guard to prevent its being supplied with ammunition. The commissioner refused to enter Edinburgh until the guard was withdrawn, and, this being done, he was met on the

¹ *Life of Livingstone* (Wodrow Society), i. 156-160.

way by an imposing cavalcade of nobles and gentry, and by an immense crowd of ministers and people. The royal proclamation was read shortly afterwards, not as it had been framed at Whitehall, but watered down to humour the insurgents until it sounded more like an apology for the king's conduct than a claim upon his people's obedience. But even in this modified form it failed to escape the fate of previous proclamations; for no sooner was it published at the market cross than the Covenanters extemporised a platform, and their leaders, headed by the earl of Cassillis, delivered a carefully-written protestation, declaring that they would persevere in their present course until their grievances were resolved in a General Assembly and Parliament.¹

The king's vacillation is a matter of history—how weak and how headstrong he was by turns, never knowing when it was wise to yield or when to resist, but dallying with compromises which generally failed in the end. That there were only two possible courses open to him was as clear as day at that stage of the crisis—either to concede the meetings of Assembly and Parliament and throw the responsibility upon them, or to resist by an armed force. Charles did neither, and the result was what, after all, in his heart he must have been anxious to avoid—war with the people of his native country.

The mission of Hamilton was fruitless, and he returned to Court for further instructions, leaving the Covenanters in virtual possession of the country. Aberdeen was the only city that stood out against them; and commissioners, including the earl of Montrose and the three ministers, Henderson, Dickson, and Cant, were sent to convert its citizens to the Covenant. The capital of the north never

¹ *Large Declaration*, pp. 77-110; *Affairs*, i. 63-80; Burnet's *Memoirs* Balfour's *Annals*, ii. 252, 263; *of Dukes of Hamilton*, pp. 52-65. Baillie, i. 74-93; Gordon's *Scots*

failed in hospitality, and the magistrates offered their visitors "the cup of courtesy" or "cup of Bon-Accord,"—so called from the motto in the corporation arms,—a collation of wine and other refreshments. But the covenanted would have no fellowship with the uncovenanted, and refused their hospitality until they had first subscribed—an insult, says an Aberdonian contemporary, "whereof the like was never done to Aberdeen in no man's memory."¹ The materials of the rejected feast were distributed among the poor of the city.

Although the commissioners would not accept the hospitality of the corporation they had to accept the refutation of the Covenant at the hands of the "Aberdeen Doctors." A lengthened correspondence took place between them beginning with fourteen demands made by the doctors challenging the authority of the Covenant. To these, answers were sent by the commissioners and replies made by the doctors, and then second answers followed by duplies. The controversy is now wearisome reading, though lightened up by occasional flashes of humour. The doctors always returned to their first entrenchment, What authority had these men for imposing the Covenant on the country? And when Henderson grew eloquent upon its Scriptural character, the doctors repeated their demand, What right have you, even were the Covenant all that you say, to force it against our conscience upon us?²

There was another northern power whom the Covenanters wished to secure—the marquis of Huntly, who had lately succeeded his father. He had been, by the desire

¹ Spalding's *Memorials*, i. 91, 92.

² *Ibid.* pp. 98, 99; Grub, iii. 13-16; Gordon's *Scots Affairs*, i. 92, 96; Garden's *Life of Dr. John Forbes*, pp. 35-40; Baillie, i. 73.

The king complimented the Aberdeen doctors upon the stand that they made against the Covenant.—Burton, vi. 235.

of king James, brought up with his own sons at the English Court, and educated in the Anglican faith. Colonel Monro, a Scot trained in the German wars, and now serving under the Covenanters, was sent to Strathbogie to make an ally of the marquis, and to threaten him with the vengeance of their party if he refused. He courteously told Monro "that his family had risen and stood by the kings of Scotland, and that, for his part, if the event proved the ruin of this king, he was resolved to lay his life, honours, and estate under the rubbish of the king his ruins."¹

The marquis of Hamilton returned in August with fresh instructions from the king, and bringing with him, as ecclesiastical adviser, dean Balcanqual, a representative at the synod of Dort, and one of the executors of George Heriot's munificent bequest to Edinburgh. The commissioner intimated the king's intention to summon the Assembly and Parliament, but this did not satisfy the Covenanters, who had now determined that Episcopacy and the Perth Articles, as well as the service book and canons, should be abolished, and the Covenant universally imposed under pain of excommunication. Charles was advised by the Scottish royalist peers to adopt his father's Negative Confession of 1581, as a means of rallying his supporters and outflanking his opponents. He said the remedy was worse than the disease, but, pressed by Hamilton, he consented. The Confession was signed and commissions issued for obtaining signatures throughout Scotland. There were thus two manifestoes in the field, the king's and the Tables'; but, though the former received nearly thirty thousand signatures, it could not compete in popularity with the more elaborate Covenant.²

¹ Gordon's *Scots Affairs*, i. 49, 50. Burnet's *Memoirs of Dukes of Hamilton*, pp. 79-81.

² *Large Declaration*, pp. 134-173;

The struggle was now practically between the king and the Covenanters, and both sides were occupied in the preliminary skirmishes which generally precede a more serious engagement. The bishops were already out of the way, afraid to face the violence of the opposition. Several of them had retired to England to avoid persecution, and Baillie mentions that it was the Covenanters' intention to have archbishop Spottiswoode excommunicated and afterwards put to death.¹ The primate was evidently in terror for his life before he withdrew into Yorkshire. It had been resolved for some time to relieve him of the chancellorship, which he now resigned at the king's request upon receiving £2500 sterling as compensation, a transaction which bears an ill flavour, though it may have been but a just repayment of expenditure, albeit incurred in an office which he never should have held.²

Two incidents occurred at this stage which slightly relieved the monotony of the fencing between king and Covenanters. The performances of a Mrs. Margaret Nicholson or Mitchelson, who is said to have been favoured with visions or trances similar to those still in vogue in Roman Catholic countries, were pressed into the service of the Covenant. She assumed the rôle of a prophetess, and her raptures about the Covenant being crowned in heaven were believed by the multitude to proceed from that quarter. More strange, if possible, than the delusion was the credence given to the imposture by men and women "of all ranks and qualities," nobles and ministers and high-born dames, who crowded to hear her, and listened to her ravings as if they had been the oracles of God.³ The other affair was that of a Jesuit priest,

¹ *Letters*, i. 65.

² Burnet's *Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton*, pp. 62, 78, 89; Baillie, i. 78, 88; Russell's *Life of Spottis-*

woode, *Hist.* pp. xlv.-xlvii.

³ *Large Declaration*, pp. 226, 227; Burnet's *Memoirs*, p. 83; Gordon's *Scots Affairs*, i. 131, 132.

Thomas Abernethy, who professed to be converted to the Covenant. He contributed revelations of a more earthly order, which were duly credited and circulated. Baillie speaks of "a very sweet discourse, and many tears over his reclaiming" in spite of the suspicion of hypocrisy, "which after all our diligence," he says, "we can find no appearance of." Time revealed what the diligence of the duped could not discover.¹ These incidents tell of a heated atmosphere, a large credulity, and the familiar use of party weapons.

Charles had agreed to a meeting of the Assembly, and the Tables were busy with instructions to every presbytery to insure the election of none but covenanting representatives, lay and clerical. Every minister who was "erroneous in doctrine or scandalous in life," in other words opposed to the Covenant, was to be put under process, and, if elected, the minority were to challenge his election before the Assembly. The moderators of presbyteries, and all chapter men known to be in favour of Episcopacy, were to be if possible excluded. In the convening of the Glasgow Assembly of 1610, the interference of king James in the election of representatives had been deeply resented by the Presbyterians, and the Assembly was maligned as a packed Assembly, yet the same tactics were now more unscrupulously adopted on the other side.² Most of the presbyteries yielded to the dictation of the Tables, so that the Glasgow Assembly of 1638 was neither a free nor a constitutional Assembly. There had been discussions in London as to the best place of meeting—whether Edinburgh, Aberdeen, or Glasgow. Aberdeen offered the most advantages to the episcopal cause, and the services of the Aberdeen doctors would have been available for its

¹ Baillie, i. 78.

² *Large Declaration*, p. 129; Baillie's *Letters*, i. 469.

defence ; but the marquis of Hamilton, who had been appointed royal commissioner, was in favour of Glasgow, hoping to use his territorial influence in the west, though that went for little in the heat of the contest.

The ulterior aim of the Covenanters, now openly avowed, was the abolition of the hierarchy, and the fall of the Episcopal Church. The packed Assembly could be trusted to condemn the bishops by a sweeping majority, but the difficulty was how to bring them before its bar with any regard to constitutional procedure. The Covenanters requested the commissioner to cite them in his own name, which he declined to do, as exceeding his powers. They then applied to the judges, contrary to their own cherished principles that ecclesiastics could only be tried by an ecclesiastical court, but the judges replied that they had no jurisdiction. As a last resort they appealed to a court hitherto untroubled with scruples about bishops,—the presbytery of Edinburgh. It is needless to remark that the jurisdiction of that, as of any other presbytery, was restricted to members within its own bounds, and that their dealing with a libel against the bishops was a ludicrous usurpation. The libel was prepared and signed by the representatives of the Four Tables and presented to the presbytery, charging the bishops with Arminianism, Popery, prelatic tyranny, with bringing in the Service Book, the Canons, and the High Court of Commission, and finally with being guilty of “excessive drinking, whoring, playing at cards and dice, swearing, profane speaking, excessive gaming, profaning the Sabbath, contempt of the public ordinances and private family exercises, mocking the power of preaching, prayer, and spiritual conference, and sincere professors ; and besides, of bribery, simony, selling of commissariat places, lies, perjuries, dishonest dealing in civil bargains, abusing of their

vassals, and of adultery and incest, with many other offences," the details of which were to be stated specifically against the different bishops.¹

The presbytery sustained the libel, transmitted it to the approaching Assembly, and ordered it to be read in all the pulpits on the ensuing Sunday. "And thus they prostituted places," Dr. Cunningham remarks, "which ought to be sacred to that charity 'which rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth,' for spreading among the people these abominable calumnies against men, many of them venerable for their piety, learning, and years, and whose only real crime was, that they were bishops. The sin was aggravated by being perpetrated on a Communion Sabbath, and almost over the symbols of our redemption."² Burton is not less severe on the libel of the bishops. "It has ever been the good fortune of those who have from time to time raised a war of extermination against bishops, to find that they are all so vicious in their lives as to render unnecessary any discussion of doctrines and ceremonies as a means of driving them from the Church."³ The black list was the outcome of the resolution expressed by Baillie with exulting candour—"No kind of crime which can be gotten proven of a bishop will now be concealed."⁴

The Assembly met in Glasgow cathedral on Wednesday, 21st November 1638.⁵ It consisted of 140 ministers, and 98 ruling elders from presbyteries and burghs, of

¹ *Large Declaration*, pp. 209-219. The writer of the *Declaration* appends to the document: "This now is that libel with which the Covenanters did undoubtedly compass their own end, which was to raise up in the people an utter abhorrence of the present bishops' persons, and an irreconcilable hatred against both their persons and calling, but with what religion, justice,

and honesty they have effected it, others besides themselves, both in heaven and earth, must judge and give sentence."

² *Ch. Hist. Scot.* ii. 99.

³ *Hist. Scot.* vi. 231.

⁴ *Letters*, i. 105.

⁵ The Assembly apparently met in the chancel.

whom 17 were noblemen, 34 lesser barons and gentry, and 47 burgesses. Few had gowns, some had cloaks, and many carried doublets, swords, and daggers. A mixed crowd, keenly curious about the proceedings of the day, and comprising many of the "devouter sex," found accommodation within the building, either on the floor of the cathedral, or in two tiers of galleries in the aisles. So great was the jostling and disorder that Baillie, not very squeamish in his ideas of reverence, breaks out in the following strain upon the behaviour of the crowd. "It is here alone," he says, "where I think we may learn from Canterbury, yea from the Pope, yea from the Turks or Pagans, modesty and manners; at least their deep reverence in the house they call God's ceases not till it have led them to the adoration of the timber and stones of the place. We are here so far the other way, that our rascals, without shame, in great numbers, make such din and clamour in the house of the true God, that if they minted to use the like behaviour in my chamber, I would not be content till they were down the stairs."¹

Discussions and protestations "more than a round dozen" were made before the Assembly was constituted and its business begun, and every one, says Baillie, was wearied of them, except the clerk, who with each protestation received a piece of gold. It was a game of ecclesiastical fencing between Hamilton the commissioner and the leading Covenanters, each striving to circumvent the other. On the second day, Alexander Henderson was chosen moderator, "a moderator without moderation," said Laud, attempting to be witty; and on the third, Johnstone

¹ *Letters*, i. 96. Baillie was then minister of Kilwinning; and afterwards for his services to the Covenant made professor of divinity in Glasgow

University, and ultimately its principal. He was also a member of the Westminster Assembly. See preface to his *Letters*.

of Warriston, the astutest of lawyers, was appointed clerk.¹ The commissioner wished to read a protestation from the bishops against the lawfulness of the Assembly, but it was met with a tumultuous clamour of "No reading." "This barbarous crying," says Baillie, "offended the commissioner most of all." He protested against the action of the Assembly, and the earl of Rothes, once a papist and now a bitter puritan, with still another change before him, protested against the commissioner's protest. The object of the Tables was to strike a decisive blow at Episcopacy by bringing the bishops as criminals before the Assembly, and so excluding them from any voice in its proceedings.² The scheme was cleverly devised, whatever may be thought of its morality.

On the sixth day of session the declinature of the bishops was read, stating their constitutional objections to the Assembly ; and at the same time three more protests were delivered from ministers in Edinburgh, Dundee, and Glasgow. Answers were made to the several objections raised in the protests, more especially as to the admission of lay elders who were unknown to that generation. The answers were prepared by Calderwood, the historian, who had returned from exile and "lived all the time of this Assembly privily beside the moderator's chamber, and furthered what he could by his studies all our proceedings."³ On Wednesday, the seventh day, the commissioner convened the Privy Council in the chapter-house, and intimated his intention of dissolving the Assembly. When it met that day and was about to vote

¹ Johnstone made no little sensation in the Assembly by producing the authentic records of previous Assemblies from 1560 to 1590, which were believed to have been lost, or purloined by the Episcopal party.

See Baillie's *Letters*, i. 129-139, for the rapture of the occasion, and Burton, vi. 227, 228, for the subsequent history of the records.

² Burton, vi. 226.

³ Baillie, *Letters*. i. 111.

on its competency to pronounce judgment on the bishops, the commissioner addressed the members, giving as his reasons for withdrawal,—the presence of lay elders, the election of ministers by lay elders, the dictation of the Tables in their election, the Assembly's insistence upon trying the bishops whom they had already prejudged and condemned. He commanded them not to proceed further, and protested against any future action on their part as being neither legal nor binding upon his majesty's subjects. Thereupon he dissolved the Assembly, and withdrew with the lords of the Council.

The Assembly were prepared for this step, and immediately voted that they should continue their sittings and proceed with the trial of the bishops. A few members retired when the commissioner left, but the great majority remained and were the more united in their action. Next day the royal proclamation was read at the market cross of Glasgow dissolving the Assembly. The Covenanters disregarded it, elated as they now were by the acquisition of lord Lorn, who in the spring of this year, at the age of thirty, had succeeded to the earldom of Argyll. He had previously succeeded to much of the family estates when his father, the same whom Huntly defeated at Glenlivet, became a Roman Catholic.¹ Of all the actions of the Privy Council distasteful to the Covenanters, Lorn had hitherto been a warm supporter, and the king's trusted friend. This was the opportunity he chose for deserting his master. Hamilton, in a letter to the king, animadverting on the several noblemen prominent in Scottish affairs, describes with some penetration the character of the earl —“He was now the only counsellor who was held up as a true patriot, a loyal subject, and zealous for the purity of

¹ The father became a Romanist about the year 1618. See Spottiswoode, iii. 257.

religion. And truly, sir, he takes it upon him. He must be well looked to ; for it fears me he will prove the dangerouslest man in the State. So far is he from advancing episcopal government that he wished it with all his heart to be totally abolished.”¹ Argyll had more cause than any other man in Scotland to seek the abolition of Episcopacy, seeing that he possessed, besides other spoils, the patrimony of four bishoprics—Brechin, Dunkeld, Argyll, and the Isles. Conduct like his was well hit off in the common satire of the day that “ many of the great land-owners became Protestants to get the property of the Church, and became Covenanters in order to keep it.”²

The Assembly was now expeditious in the business for which it had met. It passed an Act condemning the Assemblies of 1606, 1608, 1610, 1616, 1617, 1618 as null and void chiefly because of the sovereign’s interference, although the present Assembly had been still more vitiated by the tyrannical dictation of the Tables ; it condemned the Liturgy, Canons, Ordination Book, and High Court of Commission, the latter being not one whit more unconstitutional than its own Tables ; it condemned Episcopacy and the Five Articles of Perth, although both had been ratified by Assembly and Parliament ;³ and then it proceeded with the condemnation of the bishops in their absence. All the fourteen were deposed, not only from their bishoprics, but from the office of the ministry, and eight of them were also excommunicated—a sentence which carried with it the forfeiture of every civil right and exposed them to imprisonment and exile. The sentence was pronounced in presence of the Assembly by the

¹ Letter from Hamilton to king, 27th November 1638.—Peterkin, pp. 113-115.

² See Burton, vi. 225-226.

³ Baillie alone refused to condemn Episcopacy *simpliciter* and the Five Articles.—*Letters*, i. 157-160.

moderator, and ordered to be read in all the churches of Scotland by the ministers of the several congregations. The text of Henderson's sermon on the occasion was—"The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." The reader, by accident or design, read the chapter with the words—"The time cometh when they shall put you out of their synagogues," and was interrupted and told to make another selection. Three of the bishops, Dunkeld, Caithness, and Argyll—the last, Fairley, recently consecrated—recanted to save themselves, winning little respect from either side by their apostasy. Several of the ministers opposed to the Covenant were deprived by the Assembly, and the deprivation of others followed soon afterwards.¹

Episcopacy thus disposed of, the Presbyterian form of government was set up, so far as the Assembly could do it. It justified its proceedings to the king, requested his royal sanction to the same, and closed its doors 20th December 1638. And so within thirty years (1610-1638), Glasgow witnessed the establishment and the disestablishment of the Episcopal Church, in each case by a General Assembly sitting within the venerable walls of its cathedral. The ecclesiastical affairs of the country were once more thrown back into confusion. How the Covenanters used their power until Cromwell took them in hand will be told in the subsequent chapters.

¹ Baillie, in his *Letters*, *sub* 1638, gives a full account of each day's proceedings in the Assembly.

CHAPTER XIII

CHARLES I.—FROM DISESTABLISHMENT OF EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN 1638 TO BEGINNING OF GREAT REBELLION, 1643

Hamilton's report of Glasgow Assembly—His accusations against bishops—Action of Covenanters enforcing the Covenant—Beginning of civil war in Scotland—Action of Assembly in Edinburgh, 1639—Deprivation of Episcopal clergy—Fate of the bishops—Presbytery and witchcraft—Split among Covenanters—Deprivation of "Aberdeen Doctors" and clergy—Covenanting army "harries" Aberdeen—Covenanters seek military aid from French king—Covenanting army marches into England—Its leading ministers in London—Extravagant demands of Covenanters—Opening of Long Parliament, 1640—Strafford and Laud—Scottish nobles, royalist and anti-royalist—General Assembly and English Puritans—Second visit of Charles to Scotland—King powerless in Kirk and Parliament—Covenanting leaders rewarded—Rebellion in Ireland—King's return to England—Great Rebellion—Communications to the Assembly from king and English Parliament—Divided counsels in Scotland as to the civil war—Patronage—General Assembly paramount—English Puritans attend General Assembly of 1643—They invite Covenanters to Westminster Assembly—Solemn League and Covenant framed in Scotland and signed by English Puritans at Westminster—Eight Covenanters appointed to Westminster Assembly.

THE marquis of Hamilton in his report of the Glasgow Assembly to the king charged the Covenanters with tyranny and the bishops with folly. He also accused Spottiswoode, the primate, and the bishops of Brechin, Argyll, and Aberdeen of conduct unbecoming their office; but the charges had probably no other foundation than

the current calumnies of their enemies. Of all the bishops none were more unpopular than Maxwell of Ross and Sydserf of Galloway, and both incurred popular odium on account of their high church principles, and not for their private conduct. Maxwell became bishop of Killaloe and archbishop of Tuam, and in ability stood second to none of the Scottish prelates. Sydserf's character is well vindicated by Burnet of Crimond, father of bishop Burnet, in a letter written while an exile abroad to his brother-in-law Johnstone of Warriston. "I think," he writes, "there was never a more unjust sentence of excommunication than that which was pronounced against some of these bishops and particularly against this man (Sydserf), since the creation of the world ; and I am persuaded that those who did excommunicate him did rather excommunicate themselves from God than him ; for I have known him these twenty-nine years, and I have never known any wickedness or unconscientious dealing in him ; and I know him to be a learner and more conscientious man (although I will not purge him of infirmities more than others) than any of those who were upon his excommunication."¹

Early in January 1639 Hamilton went to London and met the king and Laud at Whitehall, where he gave them a fuller account of the Covenanting crisis. Laud was concerned about the critical position of the episcopal clergy amid the combustible material in Scotland, which only wanted a spark to set it on fire. They had either to sign the Covenant against their conscience, or to face persecution. In the western districts where the feeling ran high against the "malignants," as the royalists were called, they were specially exposed and defenceless. One of them, writing to dean Balcanqual, speaks of the Sunday in

¹ Garden's *Life of Dr. John Forbes*, p. 63 ; Grub, iii. 111.

the end of December, which was devoted to thanksgiving for the Assembly, as "a terrible day of trial for many ministers who are directed to profess joy when there is nothing within but fear and sorrow."¹

King and Covenanters were fast closing in the inevitable struggle. Edinburgh castle was taken by the Covenanters on 23rd March; Dunbarton castle fell into their hands "on a fasting Sunday" while the captain was at church with the garrison; and Stirling was held for them by the earl of Mar. It remained to bring Aberdeen, "that unnatural city," as Baillie calls it, under subjection to the Covenant. With this object Montrose marched north with a small army, having under him general Leslie, who had risen to the rank of field-marshal in the continental wars. As they approached Aberdeen the marquis of Huntly, unable to offer effective resistance, disbanded his men and retired to Strathbogie. The covenanting ministers now got possession of the town pulpits, and pronounced in April the sentence of the previous December upon the bishops. Robert Douglas, minister of Kirkcaldy, urged both men and women to swear and subscribe the Covenant. "The Lord knows," says Spalding, "that these town's people were brought under perjury from plain fear, and not from a willing mind, by tyranny and oppression of the Covenanters, who compelled them to swear and subscribe although they knew that it was against their hearts."²

In one of the expeditions for enforcing the Covenant the first blood of the civil war was spilt, on 29th May, at Turriff, where the Covenanters were worsted by the royalists. The affray bore the local name of the "Trot of Turriff," and was nothing more than a skirmish in

¹ Balcanqual was made dean of ham in 1639.—Gordon, *Scots Affairs*, Rochester in 1624, and dean of Dur- i. 8 note. ² Spalding, i. 134.

which three lives were lost. The marquis of Huntly made terms with Montrose on his second visit to Aberdeen, but found himself a prisoner and compelled to march south with him to Edinburgh, where he was confined in the castle.¹

The chief royalists in Aberdeen, including the learned doctors, had found safety in flight before the submission of the town. Dr. Forbes retired to his castle at Corse,² and the others, accompanied by about sixty young cavaliers eager to offer their services to the king, sailed for England. Many of the leading ministers in other parts were deposed at this time, and among them the dean of Edinburgh and his colleagues in the city churches; Dr. Wishart and Dr. Panter, both of St. Andrews; Dr. Gordon of Elgin, and John Corbett, minister of Bonhill, in the Lennox.³

After much hesitation on the part of the king the royal army mustered at York in the spring of 1639, while Hamilton appeared on May-day with an English fleet in the Forth. Nothing came of the naval expedition, and its miscarriage suggested either the incapacity of the commander or his collusion with the Covenanters. The latter hastened their preparations, and by the end of May had an army of over twenty thousand men under the experienced Leslie, known as "the little crooked soldier," at Duns Law, not far from the royalists on the further side of the Tweed. Both armies were reluctant to come to blows, and after some little parley it was agreed that the Covenanters should surrender the royal castles and their

¹ Gordon's *Scots Affairs*, ii. 256-258; Spalding's *Memorials*, i. 185.

² See reference to Forbes by Dr. Johnson in Boswell's *Tour*, p. 199.

³ Corbett was deposed by the presbytery of Dunbarton for attacking

the Covenanters, and he continued the epistolary warfare from his retreat in Ireland. Baillie, i. 188-190; Gordon's *Scots Affairs*, ii. 203, 204; Spalding, i. 124, 180; Peterkin's *Records*, pp. 260, 261.

prisoners, and that the king should summon an Assembly and a Parliament for the settlement of affairs. Baillie was present at the negotiations and was evidently touched by the dignity and grace of Charles's demeanour.¹ So courteous was the king in listening to their long speeches that they imagined he was converted to their opinions, and they startled him by begging on their knees that he would now put his hands, as they had put theirs, to the abolition of Episcopacy. He remarked with the same graciousness that it was too serious a business, and required reflection.

The king had promised to preside in person over the Assembly, but when the time came he could not face the humiliation. After the refusal of Hamilton, lord Traquair was appointed the king's commissioner. The Assembly met in Edinburgh, 12th August 1639, and the same care was taken to exclude the uncovenanted as at the Glasgow Assembly. There was now less need of the precaution, as the most prominent episcopal clergy were deposed or in exile. It was conceded to the king that the Glasgow Assembly should not be recognised as legal, or named in their written Acts, though they were free to speak of it as they pleased. The king on his part agreed to give up Episcopacy in Scotland, "not as contrary to God's law or the Protestant religion," but only as "contrary to the constitution of the Church of Scotland." It was impossible for the king to have gone further, consistently with his relations to the Church of England, and even in going so far he did violence to his own convictions, as contemporary evidence shows. The Assembly rescinded all the Acts obnoxious to the Presbyterians, one by one, exactly as they had done in Glasgow.

On the last day of the sitting, 30th August, the *Large*

¹ Baillie's *Letters*, i. 217.

Declaration, published in the king's name, though written by dean Balcanqual, was brought in for censure.¹ Proceeding on the ironical supposition that the writer had made free with the king's name they requested his majesty to recall the book and to send the author, naming Balcanqual, for trial and censure by the judge ordinary. Meanwhile they did not withhold their own censure. Andrew Cant proposed that the author should be hanged, and Dickson, the moderator,² reminded him "that that punishment is not in the hands of kirkmen."

The Assembly, before separating, renewed the Covenant, and persuaded the Secret Council to make its subscription obligatory on all classes under civil penalties.³ From being a bond of defence the Covenant was made an instrument of oppression, and blossomed, within five years, into the more tyrannical Solemn League and Covenant.

The year 1639 was marked by the deprivation of more non-covenanting clergy, by the translation of Covenanters to important charges, and by the deaths of some prominent actors who passed from the troubled scene. Harsh as Spottiswoode is said to have been to the non-conforming ministers, there were more clergy of the other school deprived and driven into exile by the Covenanters during the single year after the Glasgow Assembly of 1638 than during the whole twenty-four years—1615 to 1639—of Spottiswoode's primacy.⁴ Among the translations of the time was that of Robert Blair, who went from Ayr to St. Andrews, as "the meetest man," says his biographer, "to fill the vacant place at St. Andrews, where

¹ See Burton, vi. 276-279, who says "the statements in it are supported throughout by abundant documents, the accurate rendering of which has not been questioned."

² It was the same Dickson who

gave to this Assembly the definition of tulchan bishops, which has been already quoted.

³ Peterkin's *Records*, p. 208.

⁴ Grub, iii. 67.

there were three colleges very corrupt, and the body of the town people addicted to prelacy and the ceremonies, it being the see of the arch-bishop." Rutherford was appointed principal of St. Mary's college in St. Andrews; Henderson was transferred to Edinburgh, Dickson to the professorship of divinity at Glasgow, where soon afterwards he had Baillie for a colleague; and next year Cant was presented to St. Nicholas' church, Aberdeen. Of the Aberdeen doctors, Ross and Baron died this year—the latter being bishop-designate of Orkney. Wedderburn, bishop of Dunblane, died in England, apparently from mental distress, and was buried within the cathedral of Canterbury. Spottiswoode died in December of the same year and found a grave in Westminster Abbey, where he was buried by the king's desire. Maxwell, bishop of Ross, whom he styled "his best beloved brother," and to whom he committed the editing of his *History*, was his chief executor, and commended by him to the king as his successor in the primacy.¹

In the Assembly of Aberdeen, July 1640, Acts were passed against "the remnant monuments of idolatry, against witches and charmers, and against the revilers of the Covenant."² It is a curious phenomenon, however it be explained, that whenever Presbytery was dominant witches became prominent. It was so under the regent Moray, and again at the marriage of James VI., and now in this Assembly of 1640. And this was not the last of the persecution of these unhappy creatures. It was revived in the Assembly of 1643, when stringent Acts were passed against charming and sorcery; and shortly afterwards more than thirty persons in Fife alone, as Baillie relates,

¹ See Russell's *Life of Spottiswoode*, *Hist.* pp. cxxx.-cxxxiii.

² At this time the cathedrals of

Aberdeen and Elgin were much destroyed, as mentioned by Spalding, i. 246, 286.

were burned for witchcraft.¹ The Assembly bewailed the increase of Satan's victims when they should have bewailed the increase of superstition in themselves which made them the instruments of a detestable cruelty.²

The Assembly of 1640 was much exercised by a split in their camp on the subject of private conventicles. It was a rift in the lute, which widened in later years and separated the Presbyterians into two hostile sections, known as Resolutioners and Protesters, the former corresponding to the Moderates of a later date, "the wise men of the *via media*," while the latter were perfervid Puritans. Private meetings had been held during the rule of Episcopacy, encouraged by English Puritans of the Brownist sect, and by Scottish colonists returned from Ireland. But the liberty which the Presbyterians had, with perfect right, claimed for themselves under Episcopal rule was now denied to them under their own Covenant. Henderson, Ramsay, and Calderwood, the historian, led the opposition and passed an Act which forbade conventicles as "tending to the hindrance of family exercises, to the prejudice of the public ministry, to the rending of particular congregations, to the hardening of the hearts of natural men, and the grief of the godly." Baillie acted as mediator, and a temporary peace was patched up; but there was no real healing of the breach, and the Assembly's

¹ Baillie, ii. 88, Peterkin's *Records*, pp. 279, 354.

² See Chambers's *Domestic Annals*, iii. 135, 136, for the connection between Presbytery and witchcraft. "While Presbyterianism of the Puritan type reigned uncontrolled between 1640 and 1651, witches were tortured to confession and savagely burnt, in vast numbers, the clergy not merely concurring but taking a lead in the proceedings. From 1662 to the

Revolution prosecutions for witchcraft were comparatively rare. The reign of William III. became a new witch period in Scotland, and one involving many notable cases." See also Lyon's *Hist. St. Andrews*, ii. 18, 25, 56. As late as 1736, when the penal statutes against witchcraft were abolished, the Seceders still lifted up their "testimony" against the sinful laxity which suffered witches to live. See Leckie's *Hist of Rationalism*, i. 147.

decision was scouted by the men of the west country. Had conventicles been countenanced, there were other religionists at this time in Scotland, besides Covenanters, who would have availed themselves of the liberty, and it is not improbable that the astute Henderson saw farther than his opponents.¹

Not the least important business of this Assembly was the deprivation of the obnoxious clergy of the city and diocese of Aberdeen and the doctors of the University. Short of subscribing the Covenant, they had done all in their power to propitiate Presbytery, discountenancing the keeping of Christmas, and giving the communion to members sitting. Nothing, however, would satisfy but absolute submission, and Drs. Scroggie, Sibbald, and Leslie, with some others, were deposed from the ministry. Great effort was made to win over Dr. John Forbes, and he was several times called before the Assembly, but as he could not conscientiously subscribe the Covenant, he was now deposed, and next year deprived of his professorship. "And now," says the contemporary historian, "the Assembly's errand was thoroughly done: these eminent divines of Aberdeen, either dead, deposed, or banished, in whom fell more learning than was left behind in all Scotland beside at that time. Nor has that city, nor any city in Scotland ever since, seen so many learned divines and scholars at one time together, as were immediately before this in Aberdeen."²

While the Assembly was sitting, the earl of Argyll and general Munro with a thousand men, devastated Aberdeen and the north country; weeding the district of able-

¹ Peterkin's *Records*, 278, 279; 247. See also Garden's *Life of Dr. Baillie*, i. 248-255; Gordon's *Scots Affairs*, iii. 214-223; Guthrie, pp. 66-70; Spalding, i. 310. *John Forbes*, pp. 48-58; Baillie, i. 248; Spalding, i. 310-313, and ii. 17, 18.

² Gordon's *Scots Affairs*, iii. 226-

bodied "malignants," and sending them to join the Scots army in England. Munro was a rough specimen of the soldier, trained, like Leslie, in the great European wars, and his men were little better than the dregs of the country. They were a terror to the Aberdonians, and contemporary records tell of their "daily debouching and drinking, night-walking, combating, swearing, and bringing sundry honest women-servants to great misery."¹

The Covenanters had despatched, in the spring of 1640, lords Loudon and Dunfermline to London; and Traquair followed them soon after, bearing the copy of a letter sent by the Covenanters to the king of France, soliciting his assistance in the prosecution of a war against their own sovereign. Much odium naturally attached to them for seeking military aid from a foreign despot and a papist to boot. Loudon, compromised by the letter, was committed to the Tower.² The presbyterian Scots soon found in the English puritans more valuable allies, both in politics and religion, than the French soldiers would have proved.³

The Covenanters, notwithstanding the settlement of Parliament and Assembly in their favour, renewed the war, marching to the border in August under general Leslie, and encamping for a few weeks on the old ground at Duns Law. In crossing the Tweed, Montrose with his usual impetuosity, was the first to dash into the stream at the head of his troops. They defeated lord Conway on the Tyne, and took possession of Newcastle. This was followed by negotiations at Ripon, where it was

¹ Spalding's *Memorials*, i. 275, 352; *Book of Bon Accord*, 68. "It was the hard fate of these unfortunates that after they had become the victims of the profligacy of the Covenanting soldiery, they came under the rigid discipline of the Covenanting clergy for the expiation

of their frailties."—Burton, vi. 322.

² He pleaded that the letter had not been sent. Burton, vi. 289, gives evidence of its having reached Cardinal Richelieu, the French Secretary.

³ Peterkin's *Records*, p. 283; Clarendon's *Hist.* i. 130, 131.

agreed to pay the Scots army £850 a day. The conference was then shifted to London, and the Scottish commissioners, including the ministers Henderson, Baillie, and Blair, were lodged about Covent Garden, and had the church of St. Antholin assigned to them. Clarendon reports on the preaching of the Scots that "to hear those sermons there was so great a conflux and resort, by the citizens out of humour and faction, by others of all qualities out of curiosity, and by some that they might the better justify the contempt they had of them—that from the first appearance of day in the morning on every Sunday, to the shutting in of the light, the church was never empty."¹ Meanwhile the Covenanters effected their objects in the negotiations; for Charles, thwarted by the now dominant Puritan faction in the House of Commons, could offer no effectual resistance to Covenanting demands. The Acts of their last Convention in June were ratified; they were to receive £300,000 in the shape of indemnity for the war; and an Act of Oblivion was to be passed to include both sides, excepting the earl of Traquair, the bishop of Ross, Sir Robert Spottiswoode, Sir John Hay, and Dr. Balcanqual, who were branded as "Incendiaries," and blamed for having kindled the war. The king was powerless to protect his best friends. Success encouraged the Covenanters to enlarge their demands—no longer now for religious liberty to themselves, but for the imposition of the Kirk and Covenant upon England and Ireland. Such was the irony of events, that Charles and Laud saw their dream of ecclesiastical uniformity, which they had laboured in devious ways to promote, assuming a very different shape in the working of other minds.²

In the Long Parliament, which met in November

¹ *Hist.* i. 190.

pp. 181, 182; Baillie, i. 269-297

² Burnet's *Memoirs of Hamilton*, *passim*.

1640, both the earl of Strafford and Laud were impeached for high treason, one of the grounds of their impeachment being the encouragement they had given to the king to override the will of the Scottish people, and make war upon their country. Rothes and the other Scots commissioners took an active part in the prosecution. Baillie tells how Strafford "came forth from custody through the crowd all gazing, but no man capping to him in whose presence before that morning the greatest of England would have stood dis-covered."¹ Strafford was executed next year, and Laud was confined for three years in the Tower before meeting a like fate.

Charles, losing ground in England, sought to regain it in Scotland, and succeeded in winning some of the chief Covenanting nobles to his side. Rothes, "the father of the Covenant," was won by inducements not of the highest kind, though quite in keeping with his ambitious character. Any hope, however, of assistance from him was cut off by his death in 1641. Loudon, to regain his freedom, secretly engaged himself to the king, but his services were of little avail to Charles, owing to the mistrust with which he was regarded by the Scots. It was otherwise with Montrose, who now openly espoused the royal cause, influenced by pressure from the king, and by dissatisfaction with the changed attitude of the Covenanters, who were no longer defending their own religious liberty, but threatening the liberties of the three kingdoms by violently enforcing their Covenant and religion.² Balmerino still remained true to the Covenant, and in undying hostility to the king; while Argyll, not less unscrupulous than Rothes, and more tenacious of purpose,

¹ *Letters*, i. 272.

² See Wishart's *Memoirs of Montrose*, ed. Murdoch and Simpson, p.

14; and Editors' Preface, pp. xxxvii.-xli.

was a tower of strength to the cause from his feudal hold on the western clans.

The bickerings about private conventicles broke out afresh in the Assembly held in July at St. Andrews ; and the English Puritans introduced a fresh bone of contention by a letter, craving the Assembly's judgment on the question of congregational Independency as compared with Presbytery. The Assembly in conveying through the moderator their strong preference for Presbytery, expressed the earnest desire for one confession of faith, one catechism, one order of Church worship and government for both kingdoms—suggestions which were carried out a few years afterwards in the Westminster Assembly.¹

In order to strengthen his position in Scotland, where he knew that the traditional respect for royalty still survived, Charles paid a second visit to his native land. He arrived at Holyrood on Saturday 14th August, having supped the previous night with general Leslie at Newcastle ; and on Sunday he attended the Abbey church, and heard Henderson preach. For not attending the second service, he was courteously admonished by Henderson, and with equal courtesy he promised to be more exemplary in future. Changed times since the lightning rebukes of Knox and Melville ; changed not less since Charles's previous visit to Holyrood, when he was attended by Anglican prelates, and had all the accessories of the ritual he loved in the same venerable building. Parliament was sitting, but Charles found himself as powerless there as he was in the Abbey church, and was constrained to sanction all the proceedings of his opponents, and to ratify the actions of recent Assemblies establishing the Presbyterian form of Church government. Leading

¹ Peterkin's *Records*, pp. 292-297 ; Baillie, i. 359-397.

Covenanters were appointed to the chief places in the government, and titles were distributed among others. Henderson, the champion of Presbyterian parity, was made dean of the chapel royal, with a stipend of 4000 merks a year. In the division of the ecclesiastical spoil made at this time, the Universities got a share which was not ill spent ; but the same cannot be said of the portion which fell to the still grasping nobility, of whom Argyll was one. "Thus," says Peterkin, "did leading men, cities, and universities cast lots for the garments which had clothed the Episcopal establishment."¹

The king's return was hastened by the news of the civil war in Ireland, where the Roman Catholics, tempted by the success of the Scottish Covenanters, had broken out into open rebellion, committing atrocities after the Irish fashion, which happily did not prevail in Scotland. Charles heard of the rebellion in the beginning of November, but other business delayed his departure until the 19th. At a banquet which he gave to his nobles in Holyrood palace, he was assured by Loudon, the chancellor, that he was departing "a contented prince from a contented people." If by "the people" was meant the Covenanters, they had good reason to be contented, for they had got all that they wanted, and much more than at first they had bargained for ; but the contentment of the king was another matter, and his own feelings would doubtless have found expression in different language.

Charles had not strengthened his position by his visit to Scotland, and on his return to England he found the breach between himself and his subjects widening every

¹ *Acts of Parl. Scot.* v. 370-379 ; *Memoirs of Dukes of Hamilton*, Balfour, iii. 45 seq. ; Baillie, i. 385-398 ; Guthrie, pp. 84-93 ; Burnet's

day. At length, to escape personal violence he removed from Whitehall to Hampton Court, and thence to York; finally, on the 22nd August 1642, the royal standard was set up at Nottingham. It would be beside our purpose to follow the course of that eventful struggle except as it bears on the history of the Scottish Church.

On the eve of the war, 27th July, the Assembly met at St. Andrews, where Robert Douglas, recently appointed a minister in Edinburgh, and hereafter a prominent leader of the Church, presided as moderator. A friendly letter from the king, and a declaration from the English Parliament, defending its conduct in the purging of religion, and seeking an alliance with the Scots, were laid before the Assembly. In their answer to the king they referred to their "desire for unity in religion, and uniformity of Church government, as a special means of conserving peace between the two kingdoms." They were more cordial in their reply to the Parliament, expressing the hope that both nations might be united by a Church professing one faith, worship, and government, and that the prelatie hierarchy, the origin of their common woes, might be plucked up by the roots.¹ The documents were entrusted to lord Maitland, now a high-flying Covenanter, and better known as the duke of Lauderdale in the next reign. The king in his answer warned the Scots not to trust the English Puritans, who, he said, were at heart as hostile to Presbytery as they were to Episcopacy. The English Parliament in its reply announced the intention of calling an assembly of divines to determine the questions at issue, and requested the Scots Assembly to send some of their members for the compilation of a uniform Confession, Directory, and Catechism. To show that they were in earnest they proceeded to abolish Episco-

¹ Peterkin's *Records*, pp. 320-333; Baillie, ii. 44-54.

pacy in England, root and branch. The Covenanters concluded that no other system but their own could possibly take its place; but in this they either deceived themselves, or were hoodwinked by the English Puritans.¹

A desire for reconciliation between Charles and his English subjects found expression in a document in which a section of the Scots proposed that the queen should act as mediator, and pledged themselves that, in the event of failure, they would support the throne. Henderson, among others, signed it, so exposing himself to suspicion and reproach from the more extreme of his friends. The Privy Council was also divided about publishing the declarations of the king and the English Parliament. Hamilton favoured the king's, and Balmerino advocated the publication of both, while the earls of Lanark and Argyll fell out, "and they two," says Burnet, "let fly at one another for a while with much eagerness." Argyll and Hamilton also fell out at this time, and went their different ways, the latter to oligarchy and the king, the former to democracy and the kirk, but both, as it proved, to the same goal—the scaffold. Another attempt was made at reconciliation through a petition to the Council, signed by many noblemen and gentlemen, and known as the "Cross Petition"; "but the preachers threatened damnation to all the authors and subscribers of it, and detestable neutrality became the head on which they spent their eloquence." Their voice was still for war.²

Disputes had lately arisen on the question of Church patronage. During the previous four years, the Assembly had assumed authority to move and remove ministers as they thought best for the good of the Church, without

¹ Burnet's *Memoirs*, p. 197; *lections*, v. 390-392.

Baillie, ii. 55; Rushworth's *Col-*

² Burnet's *Memoirs*, pp. 206-209.

consulting either patrons or people. It was probably the wisest course they could then have adopted. Charles had suggested that in the case of Crown patronage the presbytery should transmit to him a leet of six ministers, from whom he should make his choice ; but the presbyteries found it difficult to name one efficient minister, to say nothing of six. Argyll, who was diligent in his attendance at Assemblies, offered for himself and the noblemen present to transfer to the presbyteries and people the right of election, provided the Assembly would bind all future presentees never to seek an augmentation of their stipends. The unworthy offer was rejected ; but it shows that Argyll's love of the Covenant stood second to his love of the Church's patrimony which he had pocketed. No settlement was then arrived at ; and Church patronage continued a bone of contention for many years to come.¹

The Assembly, more harmonious than the Parliament, was at this period the real governing power in Scotland. It met in Edinburgh on the 2nd August 1643, with Sir Thomas Hope, the lord advocate, as royal commissioner, the first commoner who had held that office, and Henderson, as moderator, for the third time. A deputation from the English Parliament, Sir William Armine, Sir Harry Vane, two other members of the Commons, and two ministers, Marshall and Nye, landed at Leith and were introduced to the Assembly. They congratulated the Scots on their reforming zeal, and reported that they had done a like good work for England in abolishing Episcopacy and ejecting the bishops from the House of Lords. They further presented letters from Parliament and from the Westminster divines, who had begun their sittings under Twiss, the prolocutor. Another letter was read,

¹ Baillie, ii. 47, 48.

subscribed by more than seventy English ministers, seeking an alliance with the Scots in the war against the royalists. The Assembly was divided as to its answer. Some still cherished the hope that Scotland might be a mediator and not a party in the strife, seeing they had now no ground of quarrel with the king; others objected to the civil league desired by the English Puritans, and insisted upon a religious Covenant.

The outcome was the Solemn League and Covenant, drafted by Henderson, and accepted by the Assembly and by the Convention of the Estates, which was then in session. Eight members—Henderson, Baillie, Douglas, Rutherford, Gillespie (ministers), and the earl of Cassillis, lord Maitland, and Sir Archibald Johnstone (Warriston)—were appointed a committee to present it to the English Parliament and Assembly of divines, and to conclude a treaty on its basis. In St. Margaret's church, Westminster, the document was subscribed on the 22nd September by the divines, the members of the Lower House, and the few peers that now formed the skeleton of an Upper House.¹ It bound them to endeavour "the extirpation of popery, prelacy, superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness, and everything else contrary to sound doctrine." It was circulated from parish to parish all over Scotland, and the committee of Estates enforced its subscription by every person, under the penalty of confiscation of their goods. The choice lay between the Solemn League and Covenant and beggary.²

There can be no justification of tyranny like this in the name of religious liberty, and what followed was

¹ "The voice of one just and wise man, Richard Baxter, was raised against this indiscriminate enforcement of so minute and terrible a confession."—Dean Stanley's *Church*

of Scotland, p. 74.

² *Acts Parl. Scot.* vi. 41-43; Baillie, ii. 83-97; Peterkin's *Records*, pp. 345-360.

equally unjustifiable. The Scots had no longer any quarrel with the king; yet after subscribing the new Covenant they made common cause with the puritan Parliament of England, and sent Leslie, now earl of Leven, across the border with more than 20,000 men. The General, when raised to the earldom, had promised never to draw sword against his sovereign; still he did so, on the pretext that religion and his country's liberties were at stake. The royal army had at first a slight advantage over the parliamentary, and while it is doubtful whether success would have eventually fallen to the royalists, the intervention of the Scots materially contributed to their defeat and to the overthrow of the monarchy. Some writers defend the action of the Scottish nation and its breach of faith with Charles on the flimsy plea that if they had not broken faith with the king, he might have beaten the parliamentary troops, and then in his triumph have broken faith with them. Such reasoning would be destructive of all confidence between men and nations.¹

¹ Baillie, ii. 99-102.

CHAPTER XIV

CHARLES I.—FROM BEGINNING OF CIVIL WAR, 1643, TO KING'S EXECUTION, 1649

Opening of Westminster Assembly—The six Scottish representatives—Publication of Directory for public worship, and suppression under penalty of Book of Common Prayer—Royalists in Scotland—Montrose's victories—His defeat at Philiphaugh—Covenanters' cruelties to prisoners—Execution of Scottish royalists—Final defeat of king's army at Naseby—Negotiations between king and Parliament—Charles seeks refuge in Scots' camp—His correspondence with Henderson on Church polity—Scots surrender king to English Parliament for "a consideration"—Westminster Confession of Faith in 1647, and Catechism in 1648—Close of Westminster Assembly—King signs the "Engagement" at Carisbrook—Covenanting insurrection at Mauchline—Defeat of Scots Royalists at Preston—Cromwell in Edinburgh—Meeting of the Estates in 1649—Purging it of Malignants—Political character and power of the General Assembly—Execution of the king.

ATTENTION was now turned to the Westminster Assembly, which had commenced its sittings under an ordinance of the English Parliament on the 1st July 1643. It was composed nominally of 151 members, of whom 121 were ministers, 10 lords, and 20 commoners, the laymen acting as assessors. On the opening day there were barely 70 present, and the average attendance did not exceed 60. The majority were Presbyterians of the puritan order, the rest were Independents. Four bishops attended the first meetings, but on the publication of the king's prohibition they withdrew. Six of the eight commis-

sioners named by the General Assembly—Henderson, Baillie, Rutherford, Gillespie, ministers, and lord Maitland and Sir Archibald Johnstone, elders—attended at Westminster some months after the opening of its Assembly.¹ The Scotsmen insisted upon being regarded as an independent committee, representative of the Church of Scotland. They had hard fighting to get a recognised place in the new scheme of Church polity for their “lay elders,” and not less difficulty in resisting the claim of Independents that each congregation should be considered a Church in itself, competent to ordain ministers and so forth. The ability of the Scots and their native pertinacity carried the day, and obtained for them an influence in the Assembly out of all proportion to their numbers. But Baillie, who gives, as usual with him, a graphic description of the debates, makes the candid admission that the success of the Scots divines in the Assembly was largely ruled by the success of the Scots army in the battlefield.

Of the six Scottish representatives at Westminster, Alexander Henderson stands first as the champion of Presbytery, probably a greater statesman than scholar or divine, but in every respect a remarkable man. He had taught philosophy in St. Andrews, been parish minister of Leuchars under Episcopacy, and at present held one of the city charges in Edinburgh. Robert Baillie, minister of Kilwinning, was now professor in Glasgow University. Like Henderson he had once been partial to Episcopacy, and both men were more moderate in their opinions than the main body of the Covenanters. His *Letters* and *Journal*, which betray a lively fancy and some little vanity,

¹ The earl of Cassilis and Douglas the minister, the other two Scots Commissioners, did not attend ; and,

judging from the records, Johnstone was not often present.

afford the fullest information of the Covenanting period, while his stores of learning and retentive memory made him a valuable referee in the Westminster Assembly. It was said that he was offered a bishopric at the Restoration ; he accepted what suited him better, the principalship of Glasgow University. Samuel Rutherford's oratory and correspondence have already been mentioned. He is described as "a little fair man," and is eulogised as "the flower of the Church" and the saint of the Covenant. He united personal piety with a warmth of language which his biographer admits is sometimes hardly compatible with decency. He was principal of St. Mary's college, St. Andrews, and the author of several controversial works, the best known being his *Lex Rex, a Plea for the People's Rights*, which was considered so seditious that it was publicly burnt at the Restoration. So greatly was his memory revered in after days among the Covenanters that, "like a mediæval saint, he has attracted round him the godly, who desired that they might be laid even where his body was buried"¹—beside the ruined cathedral of St. Andrews. George Gillespie had the briefest career of all, and in personal gifts was perhaps inferior to none of them. He had already won notoriety when a youth, in 1637, by an attack upon the Anglican ceremonies in a work which was ordered to be burnt, and ten years later he was the most violent opponent of the engagement with the king.² At Westminster he is said to have held his own in argument with the best debaters, and to have had a chief hand in framing the most important measures of the Assembly. From his brilliant gifts and brief life, he has been described as "one of that peculiar class of

¹ Bonar's *Life*, p. xxvi.

² Burnet says of Gillespie that he was "of good parts, but bold beyond

all measure."—*Memoir of Dukes of Hamilton*, anno 1647, p. 319.

men who start like meteors into sudden splendour, shine with dazzling brilliancy, then suddenly set behind the tomb, leaving their compeers equally to admire and deplore." He was now one of the Edinburgh ministers, filled the moderator's chair in the General Assembly of August 1648, and died at the close of that year. Maitland's earlier career as a Covenanter is less known than his later as a royalist, when he came to be duke of Lauderdale and a bitter persecutor of his former co-religionists—a not uncommon case with converts. Johnstone of Warriston was a thorough-going partisan of the Covenant, sincere and consistent, but bitter in his religious animosities, and in party warfare "hating men for the love of God." His legal learning, no less than his polemical zeal, enabled him to render the greatest service of any layman to the Covenanting cause. Bishop Burnet, his nephew, says of him that "he would often pray in his family two hours at a time," and that "he had very high notions of lengthened devotions, in which he continued many hours a day." On the death of Sir Thomas Hope, he became lord advocate of Scotland, and in his old age died on the scaffold.¹

Baillie and Gillespie reported to the Assembly, which met in Edinburgh in May 1644, the progress made at Westminster. One feature in the constitution and proceedings of the Assembly at Westminster was thoroughly opposed to Covenanting principles—the ordinance of Parliament which convened it, and the control exercised by the State over its proceedings. When the Scottish commissioners first appeared they could only get admission by a warrant from the two Houses of Parliament. This was Erastianism as bad as any that had set their teeth on

¹ See Kirkton's *History*, ed. Sharpe, p. 41, note, for the Scottish representatives at Westminster.

edge in Scotland, but they had to submit. Baillie finds consolation for this from what the Assembly achieved in other fields; they were framing, he said, a Directory of Public Worship which would abolish "the great idol of England, the Service Book," and he reports with evident glee the abolition of another idol—not of England alone, but of Christendom—Christmas Day. "We prevailed," he writes, "with our friends of the Lower House to carry it so in Parliament, that both Houses did profane that holy day, by sitting on it, to our joy, and some of the Assembly's shame."¹

The Directory was published in November 1644, and received the sanction of the English Parliament. Baillie and Gillespie were again sent north as delegates from Westminster to lay it before the Assembly, which met at Edinburgh in January 1645. Accepted by this Assembly, it was ordered to be observed by all ministers in the kingdom, and it was afterwards confirmed by the Scottish Parliament. No mention is made in it of Knox's Liturgy, which was quietly dropped, but it remarks of the English Book of Common Prayer that it "occasioned many godly and learned men to rejoice much in the book when it was set forth, but that it had since proved an offence, not only to many of the godly at home, but also to the reformed churches abroad," and "the gracious providence of God now called upon us for further reformation"—the outcome of which was the Directory.²

It is unnecessary to describe the Directory in detail, but the following six points are worthy of remark, if

¹ Baillie, ii. 107 *seq.*; Peterkin's *Records*, p. 400; Collier, viii. 247-252.

² In 1644 there was published at London "The New Book of Common Prayer, according to the forms of the Kirk of Scotland, our brethren in faith and Covenant." The forms are

substantially the same as in Knox's Liturgy. It is probable that in Scotland at least they did not remain long in use after the adoption of the Directory. The New Book is printed in the first volume of Hall's *Fragmenta Liturgica*.

only to show how systematically they have been disregarded until recent years, when some partial attempt has been made to observe them. Lessons from the Bible were to be read at every diet of worship, and one from each Testament was recommended, without any exposition until the chapter was ended ; the Lord's Prayer was to be used, not only " as a pattern of prayer but itself a comprehensive prayer " ; the Communion or Supper of the Lord was to be celebrated frequently ; marriage was always to be solemnised in church ; praying and reading and singing at funerals were forbidden, though the occasion might be improved by putting the mourners " in remembrance of their duty " ; and solemn fasts were to be observed, not only by a cessation from servile labours and worldly amusements, but by a total abstinence from food " unless bodily weakness do manifestly disable from holding out till the fast be ended, in which case somewhat may be taken, yet very sparingly, to support nature when ready to faint." One can only say that the Directory has for many a long day been more honoured in the breach of its precepts than in their observance by those who nominally adhere to it in Scotland.

The adoption of the Directory for public worship was followed by the prohibition, under the severest penalties, of the Book of Common Prayer, not only in Scotland, but in England and Ireland, both in public and in private. " The Puritans," says Macaulay, " had undoubtedly in the day of their power given cruel provocation. They ought to have learned, if from nothing else, yet from their own discontents, from their own struggles, from their own victory, from the fall of that proud hierarchy by which they had been so heavily oppressed, that, in England, and in the seventeenth century, it was not in the power of the civil magistrate to drill the minds of men into conformity

with his own system of theology. They proved, however, as intolerant and as meddling as ever Laud had been. They interdicted under heavy penalties, the use of the Book of Common Prayer, not only in churches, but even in private houses. It was a crime in a child to read by the bedside of a sick parent one of those beautiful collects which had soothed the griefs of forty generations of Christians.”¹

Important events at home recall our attention from the Westminster divines to the royalists in Scotland. Early in 1644 Huntly raised the king's banner in the north and failed, and Montrose, now a marquis, was equally unsuccessful in the south. Success also attended the arms of the Covenanters in the capture of Newcastle, when the earl of Crawford and Dr. George Wishart were made prisoners, brought to Edinburgh, and confined in the Thieves' Hole of the common jail, where, in company with the lowest criminals, they had to fight for their lives with swarms of rats.

Montrose soon retrieved his first defeat, and at the head of a motley army of Highlanders and Irishmen swept over Scotland like a “fiery besom” for a twelvemonth. On the 1st September 1644 he defeated lord Elcho at Tibbermuir, west of Perth, and entered that town; he then proceeded to Aberdeen, which he took by storm on the 12th, and, as he had twice before coerced its inhabitants into submission to the Covenant, he now chastised them for having submitted to it. He gained in rapid succession the battles of Fyvie, Inverlochy, Auldearn, Alford, and Kilsyth, but was surprised and defeated at Philiphaugh near Selkirk on the 12th September 1645. A year and twelve days summed up the brilliant yet fruitless campaign of the gallant Graham, first marquis of Montrose.

¹ *Hist. Eng.* chap. ii. p. 79.

Montrose himself and a few followers escaped from Philiphaugh on horseback. A portion of his infantry stubbornly defended themselves within an enclosure, and only surrendered on promise that their lives should be spared. But the day of retaliation had come, and the watchword was, "Woe to the vanquished." The ministers who accompanied the Covenanting army called out for vengeance, and cited Old Testament precedents, Agag and Amalek ;¹ and so, in breach of the general's promise, the Irish prisoners of Philiphaugh were mercilessly executed on the spot without assize or process. Some were slaughtered in the courtyard of Newark castle, others were thrown headlong into the Ettrick and Yarrow, and drowned or dashed to pieces.² No doubt they had been guilty of many excesses, chiefly of robbery and pillage, but since they were prisoners of war under an honourable pledge, their massacre affixes an indelible stain on the character of their executioners.

Other royalists of mark, prisoners at Philiphaugh, suffered with more formality of law. Sir William Rollock, Sir Philip Nisbet, and Alexander Ogilvie of Inverarity, a youth of eighteen, were beheaded at Glasgow in October. Lord Ogilvie, eldest son of the earl of Airlie, William Murray, brother of the earl of Tullibardine, Colonel Nathanael Gordon, Captain Guthrie, son of the bishop of Moray, and Sir Robert Spottiswoode, son of the late primate and formerly president of the Court of Session, were accused of treason before the Parliament. They pleaded the king's commission and the promise of quarter when taken prisoners. The pleas were disregarded, and with the exception of lord Ogilvie, who escaped from prison by the aid of his sister, they were all beheaded at St.

¹ Warriston demanded justice upon the officers of Montrose's army, who were afterwards executed.

² Lawson's *History*, p. 647.

Andrews. Spottiswoode stood in an exceptional position. He held the king's commission as Secretary of State for Scotland; he was no soldier and had borne no arms against the Covenant, nor was he guilty of any crime; only he was a royalist and the son of an archbishop. On the day before his execution he wrote to Montrose exhorting him to endeavour to win back the people to the royal cause by fair and gentle carriage and not by the inhumanities practised by the king's enemies, and at the same time commending the care of his orphan children to the marquis. His last words on the scaffold were—"Merciful Jesu, gather my soul to thy saints and martyrs, who have run this race before me."¹

The Covenanting cause was stained by these executions; and though forgiveness is a Christian duty, and an act of oblivion might well have been passed in the high court of charity, yet it is no wonder that these cruelties were remembered twenty years afterwards when the Royalists were in power and the Covenanters under their heel. No apology can be made for either royalist or covenanting intolerance, but it is only historic justice to point out that the barbarities of persecution were not all on the one side.²

The king's cause was now hopeless. At Marston Moor, near York, the parliamentary troops under Crom-

¹ Wishart's *Memoirs of Montrose*, Eng. translation, pp. 222 seq.; *ibid.* ed. Murdoch and Simpson, pp. 157-173; Balfour, iii. 307-364; Guthrie's *Memoirs*, pp. 160-169; Lawson's *Hist.* pp. 647 and 653, for slaughter of the peasantry of Cantyre at the instigation of Argyll and a "bloody preacher," John Nevay.

² Dr. Cunningham, *Hist. Ch. Scot.* ii. 148, remarks on the slaughter at Philiphaugh—"These barbarities were remembered afterwards, when the tide

of fortune was turned, and we do not wonder that they were"; and Dr. Rankin, *Hist. Scot.* ed. Story, ii. 525, writes with equal candour—"It is only fair to record these barbarities perpetrated on Episcopalians and Loyalists by the Scots Estates when in sympathy with the Covenanting leaders, for it was these and like excesses that prompted the terrible revenge that for twenty-eight years followed the Restoration of 1660."

well and David Leslie had defeated the royalists under Prince Rupert in July 1644. Laud, after three years' imprisonment in the Tower, followed Strafford to the scaffold, 10th January 1645, a victim to the resentment of the English Puritans.¹ In June 1645 the decisive battle of Naseby gave the victory to Cromwell's "Iron-sides," and the chivalry of the cavaliers was finally crushed. Three months afterwards, the defeat of Montrose, already described, extinguished the last hope of the royalists.

Meetings had been held at Uxbridge in the beginning of 1645 between commissioners of the king and of Parliament, but without result. Charles would not concede the demands of the Puritans. Flushed with military success the Parliament now insisted that Episcopacy and the Liturgy must be put down and a Puritan Church set up in the three kingdoms. Again Charles refused, and the conference broke up.

Henderson was the chief spokesman at Uxbridge on the Puritan side. He had another opportunity next year of arguing the questions at issue with the king, for, to the surprise of the nation, Charles, on the 5th May 1646, presented himself in the Scottish camp while their army was besieging Newark in Notts. From Newark the Scots retired to Newcastle, and there Charles, who was virtually a prisoner in their hands, discussed, by letters with Henderson, the relative merits of Episcopacy and Presbytery.

One effect of the discussion, not usual in such cases, was to deepen their respect for each other. So much was this the case, that when Henderson died in Edinburgh on the 19th August following, rumours were current that on his death-bed he had expressed repentance for the part he had taken against the king. The General Assembly of 1648 was at pains to contradict the reports of Henderson's

¹ See Anderson's *Colonial Church*, i. 435.

recantation. The probability is that they sprang from nothing more than the dying man's expressed regard for the king's personal piety and urbanity.¹

Charles was now importuned on every side to sacrifice his religious convictions and abolish Episcopacy. Commissioners from the Scottish and English Parliaments pleaded with him; lord Leven and the officers of his army entreated him; Hamilton, released from imprisonment, repaired to Newcastle and besought his majesty to save his crown by the sacrifice of the Church.

Pending these negotiations the English Parliament in July sought to induce the Scots army to retire from England. The Scots were ready to go on condition of payment for their military services. Nearly two millions of money was their claim, which was reduced after much haggling to £400,000, and this the English agreed to pay in four instalments, the first before the Scots army left Newcastle.

A not less important question was the disposal of the king. The English Parliament claimed a superior right in the sovereign, whom they had defied in the forum and beaten in the field until he was driven as a fugitive into the Scots camp. The Scottish Parliament demurred to their claim, but there was a power in Scotland more potent than the Parliament. The Commission of the Assembly was now predominant in Church and State. Charles would have come to Scotland and thrown himself upon the loyalty of its people, but the Commission would not suffer him to set a foot in his native country until he had first subscribed the Covenant and agreed to enforce it upon the conscience of every subject in the land. On the 17th December (1646)

¹ Aiton's *Life of Henderson*, pp. 599, 606, 664; Gillan's *Life of Sage*, pp. 72-75; Baillie, ii. 382-387;

Burnet's *Memoirs of Dukes of Hamilton*, pp. 277, 278; Grub, iii. 116-122.

they issued "A Solemn and Seasonable Warning to all Estates and Degrees of Persons throughout the Land," in which they denounced the indulgence shown to the royalists and declared their intention, unless the king complied with their demands, to pursue their ends against all opposition. On the 5th January 1647 commissioners were appointed by the English Parliament to receive the king; on the 23rd, after a residence with the Scots of eight months, he was transferred into English hands; and on the 30th the Scots army marched out of Newcastle with £100,000 paid.

It is one of the vexed questions of history whether or not the Scots sold their king to the English. It is certain that they refused to surrender him until they had got the money, and the transaction bears an ugly look. But it may be well believed that the scaffold in Whitehall was not within their purview when they parted with their unhappy monarch. They were entitled to the money apart from any question of surrendering the king, but the money would not have been paid if the king had not been surrendered.¹

The Westminster Assembly brought its labours to an end in 1648, after having sat intermittently for five and a half years and held 1163 sittings. Following the Directory of Public Worship it produced in 1647 the "Westminster Confession of Faith," and in 1648 the Larger and Shorter Catechisms. Francis Rous, a Cornishman, member of the House of Commons, and latterly provost of Eton college under the Commonwealth, prepared the metrical version of the Psalms which was adopted by the Presbyterians, who thus received from England the complete equipment of

¹ Peterkin's *Records*, pp. 489, 490; Baillie, iii. 4, 5; Rushworth's *Collection*, vi. 390-398; Burnet's *Memoirs*, pp. 279-312; *Life of Robert Blair*,

pp. 192-195. Macaulay and Burton both condemn the transaction. *Hist. Eng.* chap. i. p. 59; *Hist. Scot.* vi. 408.

their faith and worship. In the face of this, it is the veriest parody of history to represent Episcopacy in Scotland as English because of the ordination of its bishops on two occasions in England, or because of the use of the English liturgy, and at the same time to hold up Presbytery as Scottish, while every religious symbol that the Presbyterians possess—Bible, Directory, Confession, Catechisms, metrical Psalter—are all of them of English production.

Charles was taken first to Holmby House and then to Hampton Court. Weary of captivity he escaped to the Isle of Wight, and found himself again a prisoner in Carisbrook castle. At Hampton Court he had been visited by Hamilton, who had been created a duke in 1643, and by the earls of Loudon, Lanark, and Lauderdale, as a commission from the Scottish Estates to negotiate an agreement. They followed the king to Carisbrook, and at last the hunted monarch, sorely humbled, agreed to give parliamentary sanction to the Solemn League and Covenant, provided that no man should be compelled to take it against his conscience; and to set up Presbytery by way of trial for three years in England, and then to establish such an ecclesiastical polity as the Westminster divines, with twenty commissioners nominated by the king, should determine. This treaty, known as the Engagement, was signed on the 26th December 1647.¹

The commissioners reported the terms of the Engagement to a meeting of the Estates held at Edinburgh in March 1648. The Estates accepted the treaty, but the Commission of the Assembly, supported by Argyll and the rigid Covenanters, condemned it as insufficient.² The king himself, they insisted, must become a Presbyterian,

¹ So secretly was the Engagement gone about that the original document was hidden in a garden at Newport, I. W., encased in lead to keep it

from decay.—Burton, vi. 410.

² Burnet's *Memoirs of Dukes of Hamilton*, p. 365.

and the whole island, south and north, must accept the Covenant, and become Presbyterian for all time coming. This brought the Scots Parliament and Assembly into direct conflict. The Estates published a declaration of their principles, and the Commission of Assembly did the same, and ordered every parish minister to preach against the Engagement. The result was a general fermentation, and a rising of the Covenanters in the west. Two thousand of them, under their ministers, assembled in arms at Mauchline Moor in June 1648, where they were routed by general Middleton. The Parliament now broke away from the trammels of the Assembly, and sent a heterogeneous army of twenty thousand men into England to co-operate with the English royalists. Bad discipline and divided counsels led to their complete defeat at Preston by Cromwell on the 18th August, and Hamilton and many others were made prisoners.¹

This defeat, in which the "Remonstrants" against the Engagement rejoiced as in a special mercy, although it was the defeat of their own countrymen, threw political power again into the hands of Argyll and his faction. Crowds of wild Covenanters from the west hurried into Edinburgh; the committee of Estates fled before them, and Argyll was once more supreme. This escapade was known as the "Whiggamore's Raid," and in the abbreviated form of Whig it gave its name to a political party in the State. Cromwell marched from Preston to Edinburgh, and was welcomed by these new allies. He had frequent discourse with Argyll, subscribed the Covenant, and was feasted in the Parliament House. He had intercourse also with Dickson, Blair, and other ministers representing the Commission of the General Assembly, and the hardy Oliver is said to have shed tears of joy over the new

¹ Burnet's *Memoirs of Dukes of Hamilton*, pp. 353, 358.

alliance. Dickson was delighted, and said to Blair, "I am very glad to hear this man speak as he does," to which the more wary Blair answered—"If you knew him as well as I do, you would not believe one word he says."¹

In the beginning of January 1649 the Estates met. The dominant faction were careful to weed it of all malignants and friends to the Engagement; and they confirmed this action by passing the "Act of Classes," which excluded from every kind of office or trust all opponents of their policy, unless they first did public penance to the satisfaction of the judicatories of the Kirk. Many of them did so, and a more humiliating spectacle or one more derogatory to the Scottish reputation for independence cannot well be imagined.² While Pryde was purging the English Parliament, the Protesters were equally drastic in purging the Scottish Parliament. In due time the retributory nemesis overtook them both.

The government of Scotland, from causes already described, had fallen into the hands of a set of religionists most incompetent to guide it. They had protested in former days against bishops sitting in Parliament and in the Privy Council, as secularising the Church, and now the whole politics of the kingdom were dragged by them into the arena of their Assembly and its formidable Commission. Politics rather than religion had been their principal business for some years, and the anarchy and

¹ *Life of Robert Blair*, pp. 208-212.

² *Kirkton's History*, p. 48; *Acts of Parl. Scot.* vi. 341, 352; Balfour, iii. 373-377; Guthrie, pp. 235-253; Burnet's *Memoirs of Dukes of Hamilton*, pp. 354-375. Burton, vi. 421-424 remarks—"Through all the wild work of this period, the utterances of the Legislature and the supreme tri-

bunals generally preserve a grave decorum, but these Acts ('Classes') are full of vehement raving." Warriston is credited with drafting them. Argyll's speech on passing the Act was called "the breaking of the Malignants' teeth," and that of Warriston who followed him was "the breaking of their jaws."

terror that prevailed, until the strong arm of Cromwell delivered Scotland from their tyranny, is proof of their fanatical folly.¹

The Engagement with Charles at Carisbrook was the last effort of his Scottish subjects to save him. Had he agreed to the same humiliating terms at Newcastle the political prospect in Scotland would have been changed, but whether to the king's advantage or not is doubtful. It was too late now. The Remonstrants were too strong for the Engagers. Charles was taken from Carisbrook to Hurst castle, and from that in the month of December to Windsor where he was permitted a short interview with Hamilton who was still a prisoner. The duke knelt and kissed the king's hand, calling him "my dear master." "I have been so indeed to you," said the king as he embraced him. The two men parted, both of them bound for the scaffold. Charles was brought to London in January 1649, put on his trial on the 20th, and condemned to death on Saturday the 27th. On the morning of the 30th he received the Holy Communion from bishop Juxon, and in the afternoon he was beheaded before his palace of Whitehall. In their estimate of the character and career of Charles the First all parties are agreed on one point, "that nothing in his life became him so well as the manner in which he left it."

¹ Two Presbyterian Church historians, Principal Lee and Dr. Cook, remark upon the political aspect of

the Kirk at this time. Lee, *Hist. Ch.* ii. 309, and Cook, *Hist. Ch.* iii. 163.

CHAPTER XV

CHARLES II. AND THE COMMONWEALTH—FROM EXECUTION OF CHARLES I., 1649, TO RESTORATION OF CHARLES II., 1660

Covenanters' terms with Charles II.—Execution of Huntly—Deputation visits Charles at the Hague—Their report to Assembly—Fanaticism of Covenanters—Montrose's last campaign, defeat, and execution—Second deputation to Charles at Breda—His arrival in Scotland—Cromwell's return—Defeats Scots army at Dunbar and takes possession of Edinburgh and Glasgow—Charles's coronation at Scone—Dissension among the Scots in Parliament and in Assembly—Covenanters split into "Resolutioners" and "Protesters"—Cromwell follows Scots army and defeats it at Worcester—Monk's subjugation of Scotland—Condition of the country after thirteen years of the Covenant—Commonwealth established—Colonel Cotterel disperses the Assembly—Cromwell's ecclesiastical polity—Resolutioners and Protesters before Cromwell—Covenanting tyranny in Aberdeen—English sectaries in Scotland—Persecution of Romanists—Death of Cromwell—Sharp as an agent of the Resolutioners—Restoration of Charles—Sharp's interview with king—Rescissory Act of Scots Parliament—Executions of Argyll, James Guthrie, Govan, and Warriston—The Synods and Episcopacy—King's bad faith.

CHARLES II. was proclaimed king at the cross of Edinburgh on the 5th February 1649, within a week of his father's death. The Scottish Estates two days afterwards passed an Act which required that the king, before being admitted to the exercise of his rights as sovereign, should subscribe the Covenants, accept the Westminster formularies, and agree that civil affairs be transacted in Parliament, and ecclesiastical affairs in the Assembly. On the

9th March they abolished Church patronage, and recommended that the General Assembly should provide through the presbyteries for the interests of congregations. They also appointed a commission of seven persons, including the earl of Cassillis and Baillie the minister, to visit the king in Holland and to offer him the crown upon these terms.

The Scottish Estates professed to lament the execution of Charles as a crime, and yet they executed the marquis of Huntly for no other fault than his loyalty. He made no effort to save himself, and declared that his chief desire, now that the king his master was gone, was to follow him to a better world. On the morning of his execution, 22nd March, he came down from the castle (Edinburgh), where he had been a prisoner for two years, dressed in the mourning garb which he had worn since the king's death. On the scaffold he declared his loyalty to the king, and his faith in the reformed Catholic Church, and recommended the same to the people. "And thus," says the chronicler, "the cruel and merciless Covenant swept away this faithful and constant royalist to follow his master."¹

The deputation appointed by the Estates sailed from Kirkcaldy on the 17th March, and met Charles in his little court at the Hague, where Baillie propitiated the young king by a speech expressive of their "mournful sorrow for that execrable and tragic parricide, that hardly expressible crime"—the death of the late king—"which stamps and stigmatises with a new and before unseen character of infamy the face of the whole generation of sectaries and their adherents from whose hearts and hands that vilest villainy did proceed."² The speech was plausible in Baillie, and pleasant to Charles; but when they

¹ Gordon's *Abridgement of Britain's Distemper*, pp. 223-226; Burnet's *Memoirs*, pp. 333, 353; Wisheart's *Memoirs of Montrose*, p. 350;

Mailand Club Misc. ii. 422; Balfour, iii. 393.

² Baillie's *Letters*, iii. 85.

proceeded to business and sought to impose the Covenants and the Westminster standards not only on the king but on his three kingdoms without distinction, Charles told them they were asking more than he had any right to promise on behalf of his subjects. It is said that his first inclination was to prefer exile to the Covenants; but his impressions were never very deep, nor his scruples very formidable; and his conscience, which was of the elastic order, got over difficulties insurmountable to other men. His court was divided in its advice respecting the proposals from Scotland, and the Commission had to rest satisfied with presenting to the king copies of the two Covenants and the Westminster documents, "bound together," says Baillie, "in a book so handsome as we could get them."¹

Their report of the conference with the king was made to the Assembly, which met at Edinburgh in July 1649, under Douglas, the successor of Henderson in the leadership of his party. In the same fanatical spirit as of old they decreed that all who had been favourable to the Engagement, and all royalists, whom they designated malignants, should submit to Church discipline or suffer the penalty of excommunication; and likewise that the Parliament and the army should both be purged of malignants. The same spirit prompted the Assembly to appoint visiting committees to perambulate the country and depose suspected ministers who had been spared by presbyteries and synods.²

Montrose, on the death of Charles I., had expressed his determination to place his master's son on the throne of Scotland, or perish in the attempt. He received his

¹ *Letters*, iii. 87.

iii. 430; Dalziel's *Hist. University of Edin.* ii. 148.

² Peterkin's *Records*, pp. 542-559, 588, 589; Baillie, iii. 91-97; Balfour,

commission from the king in the spring of 1650, and left Holland with about seven hundred men, enlisted abroad. He arrived in the Orkneys, where he enrolled a few more recruits for his enterprise ; and from the islands he crossed into Caithness. Before many days' march he was met by Colonel Strachan with an army of Covenanters at Invercarron, near the present railway station at Bonar Bridge. There his motley force was defeated and dispersed on the 27th April. Montrose took refuge in the wilds of Assynt, where he was captured and given up, apparently by treachery, to the Covenanters. He was taken to Edinburgh where he had no mercy to expect, and found none. The day before he reached the capital, 17th May, he was condemned to be hanged on a gallows thirty feet high, and the sentence was executed at the market cross with every conceivable barbarity and indignity on the 21st May. Montrose's personal appearance was commanding, and on the day of his execution it lost nothing by the special pains bestowed upon his dress. Huntly had gone to the scaffold in the garments of mourning ; Montrose went like a bridegroom adorned for marriage. There was always a dash of the gallant about the marquis, and he was as brilliant in speech on the scaffold as he had often been in arms on the battlefield. His last words addressing the people were : " I beg you of your charity to judge me fairly, and desire the prayers of the good for the salvation of my soul, soon to be freed from the prison of this body. I pray for you all, and earnestly but humbly implore God to avert the wrath so long impending over this poor kingdom. Let men triumph as they will over the perishing remains of this body ; but never shall they hinder me to love, reverence, and fear God, and to honour the king, in death as in life. I leave my soul to God and my Redeemer, my service

to the king, my honour to my country and posterity, my goodwill to my friends, and to you all my truest love." In accordance with the barbarous sentence, his body after death was beheaded and quartered, his head being fixed on the Edinburgh Tolbooth, and his limbs exposed at the market crosses of Glasgow, Stirling, Perth, and Aberdeen. All this indignity was remembered afterwards by the royalists, and we cannot wonder at retaliation, however much we may deplore it. Argyll, a gratified witness of his great rival's fate, was himself the next victim of the executioner. Several of the officers of Montrose were also executed for their share in his "treason," and among them, John Spottiswoode, grandson of the archbishop.¹

A second commission from Scotland had waited upon the king at Breda in 1650, and after the failure of Montrose's expedition, which Charles now repudiated, he agreed to the commissioners' terms. Alexander Jaffray, one of their number, recorded in after years his sense of the transaction as follows: "We did sinfully entangle and engage the nation and ourselves, and that poor young prince to whom we were sent; making him sign and swear a Covenant which we knew from clear and demonstrable reasons that he hated in his heart. Yet finding that upon these terms only he could be admitted to rule over us (all other means having then failed him), *he* sinfully complied with what *we* most sinfully pressed upon him; where, I must confess, to my apprehension, *our* sin was more than *his*."²

Charles arrived at Speymouth in June 1650, and before he left the ship was compelled to subscribe the

¹ Napier's *Montrose and the Covenanters*, ii. 530-549; Wishart's *Memoirs*, pp. 335-337; *Ibid.* ed. Murdoch and Simpson, pp. 322-334; Baillie, iii. 61; Balfour, iv. 8-32;

Clarendon, pp. 741-743; Aytoun's *Lays of the Cavaliers*; see also Article in the *Scottish Review* for July 1884.

² *Diary of Alex. Jaffray*, p. 55.

in the habit of preaching, and lay preaching was an abomination to the Covenanters.¹ When they remonstrated with Cromwell on the practice, he asked them if all that they preached was "infallibly agreeable to the Word of God," adding with mild but caustic irony, which pierced like one of his own bullets, "I beseech you, gentlemen, by the bowels of Christ, think it possible you may be mistaken." From Glasgow, Baillie says, the ministers and magistrates all fled, he himself going to the Isle of Cumbrae, at the approach of Cromwell and his troopers. Old Zachary Boyd held his post and "railed on them all to their very face in the High Church."²

The more rigid Covenanters, headed by Patrick Gillespie, minister at Glasgow (brother of George, of Westminster fame), by James Guthrie, minister at Stirling, and by colonel Strachan, now popular with the party from his defeat of Montrose, organised a small army in the west and published a remonstrance against the king and his advisers for their lack of zeal on behalf of the Covenants, denouncing at the same time the committee of Estates for their rapacity, and calling on all who were guilty among them to restore their dishonest wealth of which they had robbed the Church and the poor. Argyll, whom the cap fitted, was severe in his censures of the remonstrance, and Cromwell's soldiers were equally stern with the army of the Remonstrants, defeating them at Hamilton in December, after which Strachan went over to Cromwell.

In the midst of the national misery³ the king was crowned at Scone on the 1st January 1651 after two

¹ The Covenanters said of Cromwell's preaching corporals that "they were weil gifted yet not ordourlie callit."

² Baillie, iii. 129.

³ Baillie, *Letters*, iii. 126-128, paints in strong colours the deplorable condition of the country at this time.

days' fasting, the one for the sins of the country, the other for the sins of the king and his father's house. The crown, the sword, and the sceptre were at hand, but the old abbey church, the scene of many former coronations, was gone. Charles was crowned in the parish church, Argyll putting the crown on his head; while Robert Douglas improved the occasion by a long sermon in which he denounced impartially Engagers, Remonstrants, and Sectaries. He then turned to the king denouncing the sins of his parents, and warning him that only by avoiding their evil ways could he escape wrath and condemnation. There was no anointing in the ceremony; for, said the preacher, "the bishops, as limbs of antichrist, are put to the door; let the anointing of kings with oil go to the door with them." By way of compensation for this omission the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant were read over to the king, and once more subscribed by him.

Dissensions were still rife in Church and State. The mischievous Act of Classes excluded half the able-bodied men of the country from serving in the army, as being tainted with so-called malignancy, and it reduced the members of Parliament to a mere remnant, at a time when the service of every available Scot was needed to save his country from becoming, what it did become for the first time in history, a conquered province of England, annexed by the sword of Cromwell. The committee of Estates would have repealed the Act at their meeting of 4th December 1650, but they stood in awe of the Church, which by its Commission "ruled all things, civil as well as sacred."¹ The Commission met on the 14th and gave a wary and qualified approval, requiring malignants to appear in church as penitents clothed in sackcloth before

¹ Dr. Cunningham, *Hist. Church Scot.* ii. 166.

they could enlist ; and many, even some who had been campaigners with Montrose, went through the humiliating process. The Parliament, taking courage from the Commission, rescinded in May 1651 the suicidal Act that had disintegrated the nation to please a fanatical section. The Commission had still, however, to reckon with the Assembly. At a meeting of the Assembly at St. Andrews in July 1651, Cant, the moderator, preached in the forenoon against the Commission, and Douglas in the afternoon from the same pulpit defended it. A stormy debate followed, in which it was proposed to exclude the members of Commission from the Assembly for their scandalous conduct. Meanwhile some English soldiers had landed in Fife, and the members fled to Dundee, where they continued their bickerings. The leaders of the protesting party, Cant, Rutherford, Gillespie, Guthrie, and Menzies, did not, however, appear. Rutherford's protest, signed by twenty-two ministers, was read, challenging the lawfulness of the Assembly on the ground that both the king and the Commission had violated its freedom. The absence of the leading Protesters indicated that the more moderate section had triumphed, and they showed their moderation by now deposing Gillespie and Guthrie. From this time Presbyterianism was split into two hostile factions, the *Resolutioners* and the *Protesters*, the former, led by Douglas, Baillie, and Dickson, adhering to the resolutions of the Assembly ; the latter protesting against them in the names of Cant and others before-mentioned. This Assembly, like that at St. Andrews, was abruptly terminated by the scare of English soldiers in the Firth of Tay.

We now pass again from the forum to the camp. The royalist soldiers were massed at Torwood, between Stirling and Falkirk. Cromwell, wary as before, not daring to attack them in their stronghold, crossed the Forth

at Queensferry and marched upon Perth, which he took without difficulty. He had now got behind the king's army and was ready to advance, when the royalists moved their camp and made a sudden march into England. Cromwell followed on their heels, and on the 3rd September, his "lucky day," the anniversary of Dunbar, he engaged the Scots army at Worcester and won his "crowning mercy." The king escaped to France, partly by the aid of Father Hudleston, who will be heard of again; the earl of Lauderdale and generals Leslie and Middleton were among the prisoners, and the second duke of Hamilton was, with many other Scots, among the slain.

General Monk was left by Cromwell in Scotland to complete its subjugation, which he effectively did in a few months. On the 1st September he took Dundee by storm. It had become a city of refuge for those who had been driven out of Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Perth. During its siege the English soldiers captured the committee of the Estates—some forty in number—in the secluded village of Alyth, which they had supposed safe from invasion. Among those captured were the earls of Leven and Crawford, and the two ministers Douglas and Sharp. Monk had them all shipped off by sea to London, where they were detained for a time as prisoners, out of harm's way.

Such was the miserable end of thirteen years (1638-1651) of Covenanting ascendancy in Scotland. The nobles, who were the instigators of the revolt against Charles I., saw their order crushed, many of them exiled and ruined in fortune, their Parliament closed, their nationality abolished, and all by a plebeian Protector who could be on occasion as despotic as any Stuart king. The Presbyterians who had contended, and in principle rightly, for their freedom of Assembly, but who had converted

their Assemblies into arenas of strife, and their Covenants into instruments of oppression, soon had the doors of their Assembly locked, their Covenants scorned, and their liberties placed at the mercy of a religious enthusiast as fanatical in some respects as themselves, but happily to them ten times more tolerant than they were to others. It was a strange and unexpected turn in the wheels of the nation's fortune. Who could have anticipated that this would be the outcome of the Liturgy riots of 1637 in Edinburgh, or of the covenanting Assembly of 1638 in Glasgow?

Scotland had ceased to be a nation as well as a kingdom, and was no more than a 'province in the Commonwealth of England. Its ecclesiastical polity, like its civil, was in complete subordination for the next ten years to puritanised England; and the influence of that Puritan *regime* has deeply impregnated for two centuries the religion, worship, art, habits, manners, and amusements of the Scottish people. England, the birthplace of Puritanism, passed by a sudden rebound from the austerity of the Commonwealth to the laxity and frivolity of the Restoration, until it finally settled down into a sober medium between the extremes. Scotland is but slowly recovering from the mixed influences of the seventeenth century, and in the transitional state of our present-day religion only a long-sighted seer can forecast what the final outcome shall be.

In January 1652 Monk and Lambert were joined by Oliver St. John and Harry Vane, as "Commissioners of the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England for ordering and managing of the affairs of Scotland." They lived in moderate state in Dalkeith castle; and on the 4th February issued their first proclamation announcing the powers committed to them for the establishment of order and good government by means of Courts of Law

throughout the country. It was no vain declaration. Scotland was better governed during the ten years of the Commonwealth than during any other decade of that century. The self-seeking tyrannical nobility and the arrogant presbyteries had both found a master who compelled them to keep their place and the peace.

At the Assembly of July 1652, held in Edinburgh under Dickson as moderator,¹ sixty-five of the Protesters whose leaders' names are now familiar—Rutherford, Cant, Gillespie, Guthrie—joined by Warriston, entered the usual protest against the lawfulness of the Assembly. They were always protesting by speech or document against some person or thing, and they now took the unusual step of appealing to the English government for help against the Assembly on the ground of their common hatred to "Charles Stuart, styled king." The Assembly threatened them with the terrors of ecclesiastical discipline unless they withdrew their protest. The Protesters' application was highly suggestive, and afforded a reasonable pretext to Cromwell for dealing with an Assembly which had fallen from its original status as a spiritual court, and had now degenerated into a political conclave dangerous alike to civil and religious liberty.

Cromwell resolved to take the Assembly in hand. It met again in Edinburgh on the 20th July 1653, under Dickson, the previous moderator. At the close of the opening prayer² colonel Cotterel appeared in the church, after having surrounded it with musketeers and cavalry, and asked the moderator by whose authority they were convened, whether of the Commonwealth Parliament, or of the commander-in-chief of the English forces, or of the

¹ He became professor of Divinity at Edinburgh in 1650.—Dalziel's *Hist. of University*, ii. 156.

² The description of the scene that followed is from Baillie, an eyewitness.—*Letters*, iii. 225, 226.

English judges in Scotland? Dickson answered that they were an ecclesiastical synod, a spiritual court of Jesus Christ that meddled not with anything civil, and that their authority was from God. The disavowal of intermeddling with civil affairs must have been as amusing to the Cromwellian officer then as it is to the historical student now. However, the soldier had not come to argue but to act, and his action was to clear them out of the place and out of the city. They began to protest against "this unheard-of and unexampled violence," but there was no arguing with musketeers and cavalry. Man by man they had to file out into the street, and were then conveyed through the West Port under military escort a mile out of town to the Bruntsfield Links. Here Cotterel stopped them, and after taking a list of their names, solemnly forbade them ever to meet again. The Assembly met no more for many years.

The dispersion of the Assembly by military force was regarded with mixed feelings by the Scottish people. The Royalists rejoiced in it as the due reward of their tyranny; the Protesters were still more jubilant at the overthrow of their adversaries who had cast them, the saints, out of the synagogue; the mass of the people were probably indifferent, as the Assembly had for years ceased to command, what it once commanded, some measure of respect for its defence of constitutional privileges. There were others, like honest Baillie, who grieved over the fallen Assembly with all its faults. "Our hearts are sad," he writes, "our eyes run down with water, we sigh to God against whom we have sinned, and wait for the help of His hand; but from those who oppressed us we deserve no evil." Baillie forgot that his "oppressors," once their covenanted brothers, now called Sectaries, were English Independents who regarded popery, prelacy, and

presbytery as three different growths from the same root of error.¹

Kirkton, the Covenanted historian,² gives a rosy description of the state of religion and morals at this time, contrary to that of every contemporary writer, and to what may be conceived as likely in the midst of civil war and social disintegration. "Then was Scotland," he says, "a heap of wheat set about with lilies, uniform ; or a palace of silver beautifully proportioned, and this seems to have been Scotland's high noon." Principal Lee,³ a witness for Presbytery, of which he was an ornament, says of Kirkton's picture : "Unless I were to believe that the whole of the records of the Church courts that I have examined were fabrications, I must really look upon Kirkton's description as being something very extravagant—I would almost say a romance."⁴

The government of the Church by session, presbytery, and synod continued as before ; and the bitterness between Resolutioners and Protesters did not abate. While the Resolutioners were in the majority, the Protesters were the popular favourites from their ecstatic style of preaching and praying. Baillie, not very partial to this school, describes their style, which, he says, amazed him, as "a strange kind of sighing, the like whereof I had never heard, as a pythonising out of the belly of a second person."⁵ To these hysteric prayers the people responded by spasmodic sighs and groans which resounded through the church. It was at this period that the Protesters

¹ Macaulay's *Hist. Eng.* chap. i.

² *History*, pp. 48-65.

³ *Lectures on Ch. of Scot.* ii. 443-448.

⁴ For confirmations of Lee's estimate see Nicoll's *Diary*, pp. 59, 60 ; Baillie's *Letters*, iii. 249-252 ; Monk's Letter from Scotland to Richard

Cromwell, September 1658, cited by Burton, vii. 67 ; and Letter from English soldier resident in Scotland, date September 1650, in *Scot. Hist. Society*, vol. xvii. 134-140, ed. by Gardiner.

⁵ *Letters*, iii. 245.

instituted the fast-day before the Communion, and the multiplicity of sermons before and after "the Sacrament Sabbath" to crowds drawn from neighbouring parishes. They also began the practice of monthly communions, but not seldom the half of the intending communicants were cut off for what was called defection; and sometimes from the same cause there was no celebration at all.

Something had to be done to regulate ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland, and to check the bitter contentions of Resolutioner and Protester. The Protesters, republicans at heart, stood nearer to Cromwell's platform; but, while they hated Charles Stuart and monarchy, they were not less opposed to all interference of the civil power in the spiritual domain of the Church. Cromwell, in the summer of 1654, summoned the leaders of both parties to a conference with him in London. He found the Resolutioners the more tractable, and the diplomatic abilities of one of their number, James Sharp, helped to commend them to the Protector. Of Sharp he had closer acquaintance in after years, when he bestowed upon him an epithet which has stuck to him like a thistle-burr—"Sharp of *that* ilk." The outcome of the conference was an ordinance dividing Scotland into five districts, and appointing over each a mixed tribunal of clergy and others, entrusted with the power of admitting or ejecting ministers, so far as the possession of church, manse, and stipend was concerned. It was a tribunal as absolute as any High Court of Commission set up by the Stuarts, and was in little favour with either party. But Cromwell did not bear the sword in vain, and compelled Church as well as State to respect his authority. The little finger of the Protector could be as heavy as the monarch's hand when occasion required.¹

A conference was held at Edinburgh in November,

¹ Baillie, iii. 253, 282; Lee's *Lectures*, ii. 376.

1655, to effect an accommodation between the two factions, and Blair, who had hitherto been neutral, acted as mediator. The result was a further estrangement, chiefly due to the opposition of two extreme Protesters, Warriston and Guthrie the minister. In 1656 the Resolutioners sent Sharp to London to use his influence with Cromwell to have their rivals prevented from thrusting their nominees upon every vacant parish. A deputation of the leading Protesters, Warriston, Gillespie, and Guthrie, immediately followed Sharp; and the Protector experienced, not for the first time, that the most obstinate and intractable subjects in all his Commonwealth were the refractory ministers from Scotland. Their unreasonableness and mutual intolerance were such that all his diplomacy failed to bring them to terms, and so, yielding to the arguments of Sharp, he at last took sides with the Resolutioners. Henceforth the two factions became confirmed foes, more embittered in mutual dislike than were the Episcopalians and Presbyterians. A writer of the times says that they regarded each other "rather as of different religions than of different persuasions about things which were not fundamental."¹

The Episcopalians had no separate existence as a body during these troubles. The intolerance of the Covenants had removed many of the clergy episcopally ordained, and had driven some of them into exile; and the same intolerance would certainly have prevented the formation of separate congregations had the Episcopalians ventured on that step. If they had done so there would have been in Scottish Church history a prelude of the bitter persecutions which disgraced the reigns of Charles the Second and his brother. Whether it is a reproach to

¹ *Life of Robert Blair*, pp. 329-334, 336; Baillie, iii. 266-273, 330-355, and 568-573.

them that they did not assume this bolder attitude, defy the Solemn League and Covenant, and endure persecution if necessary, we shall not presume to say. The case of Sir Alexander Irvine of Drum, an Episcopalian,¹ who appealed to the commander of the English troops at Aberdeen, in 1652, for protection from its presbytery, is an example of what resistance to the Covenants entailed. Irvine said to the presbytery—"I wish to God you would remember how much ye cried out against the tyranny of bishops, when they were urging some of your number who were refractory to Episcopacy, that there should be had some regard to tender consciences which were of another judgment. But so soon as ye got the power into your hands, neither minister nor laird, man, woman, nor child, was spared, nor any regard had unto them, whatever quality or condition they were of; all were forced not only to obey you, but (which is the greatest point of tyranny over men's consciences) they were made to swear that they thought as you would have them, albeit to your own knowledge many thought the contrary." As a matter of history, Episcopalians were commonly numbered among the Resolutioners, the Moderates of that day, few of whom deemed that either Presbytery or Episcopacy was of divine right. This has to be borne in mind when we reach the next stage, not far off, the establishment of Episcopacy for the second time in Scotland since the Reformation.

The military conquest of Scotland brought new religionists into the country. The soldiers, judges, commissioners, and other English officials, by whom the government was now administered, were mostly Puritans, many of them zealous propagandists, who made and left their mark upon the religion of the Scottish people.

¹ Grub, iii. 164, 165.

What was discussed in courts and in garrisons came to be talked over in the burgh towns and in the homes of the peasantry. Scotland was thus made familiar with the names of Independents, Brownists, Separatists, Sectaries, Cross-Covenanters, Anti-Covenanters, Old-Horns, New-Horns, Cross - Petitioners, Barbartaries, Quakers, Anabaptists — an uncouth nomenclature which doubtless contains what logicians call cross divisions.¹

There was still another religious Community, once dominant, now fallen, living on lines apart, yet not sufficiently apart to escape notice and persecution. Whether under the monarchy, or under the commonwealth, the fate of the papist was to suffer. No change of government brought any change in the laws which persecuted him for his creed. The tolerance of Cromwell would not tolerate him any more in Scotland than in Ireland; and even Charles the First was not blameless as a persecutor of the Romanists, though he had married a Roman Catholic wife. They were forbidden to send their children abroad for the education they could not receive at home; they were frequently cited before the Privy Council; the prisons were seldom without some priest as a confessor for his faith; and even the laity suffered, as, for example, lady Abercorn, who was imprisoned, to the ruin of her health, for three years in the Tolbooth of Edinburgh. In 1633 pope Urban VIII. addressed a letter to queen Henrietta entreating her intervention in behalf of the distressed Scottish Romanists. The Jesuit Mambrecht had been sentenced to death a few years before and his death-warrant signed by Charles, when, at the queen's intervention, the sentence was cancelled.

There were few secular Roman priests in Scotland at

¹ See Nicoll's *Diary*, p. 60.

this period, not more than five or six, but the regular orders, Jesuits chiefly, with occasional visits of Capuchins, Benedictines, Franciscans, Lazarists—the last order sent by St. Vincent de Paul—ministered intermittently to the scattered remnant of Roman Catholics. Father Mambrecht, writing in 1640, and again in 1641, gives a vivid description of their sufferings. In spite of persecution they recovered and reconciled to the Roman faith over two thousand people in the Hebrides, while the numbers reconciled in the Highlands of the mainland are estimated at more than ten thousand. Any one travelling in those districts will find evidence even now of the truth of these statements. The priests baptized, married, communicated the people, travelling from place to place over moor and loch, by sea and land, enduring many hardships. They laboured long under a special disadvantage. There was no bishop to superintend the scattered flock, to give the seal of confirmation to the baptized, to ordain candidates for the ministry. A prefect with episcopal rank had been promised, but though Rome was not unmindful of the flock in the wilderness, and aided them in various ways, spiritual and temporal, still no Roman bishop was appointed for Scotland till the close of the seventeenth century.¹

Cromwell died on 3rd September 1658. The day on which he had twice defeated his enemies, the Scots, was the day on which the last enemy overtook him. His feeble son Richard assumed the title of Protector for a brief period, and was then glad to retire into the private life for which he was better fitted. The three kingdoms were united in the common desire for a restoration of the monarchy. Ireland had no reason to bless the protectorate. Cromwell had left his bloody mark on Erin's green isle,

¹ For authorities see Bellesheim, iv. 1-88 *passim*.

and his memory a legacy of hatred in nearly every Irishman's breast. Scotland, notwithstanding the civil and commercial blessings she owed to his government, was getting restive under his iron rule. The brethren could not, as in the palmy days of the Covenant, bite and devour one another under the toleration enforced by Cromwell, which they denounced as "a deadly and damnable sin." The delirium of England at the Restoration is evidence that the loyalty of its people was only suppressed, not extinguished, by the strong man armed. The memory of King Charles's tragic death, the abolition of constitutional government, the overthrow of the Anglican Church and the penalties imposed upon its members, who were the bulk of the nation, for the profession of their religion—so inconsistent with the Protector's avowal of toleration—all contributed to the reaction in favour of monarchy in England.

General Monk's position at the head of an armed force in Scotland gave him an exceptional advantage as arbiter in the nation's destiny. In November 1659 he marched south with his army—Sharp meeting him at Coldstream and writing the proclamation made by the General—to decide the issues of government, as the Pretorian Guard used to decide it in the days of imperial Rome. The result was the recall of Charles II. to the throne.

Sharp had been sent as envoy to Cromwell from the Resolutioners in 1658, when Baillie describes him as "that very worthy, pious, wise, and diligent young man, Mr. James Sharp, the great instrument of God in crossing the evil designs of the Remonstrants." Sharp was again in London during the protectorate of Richard Cromwell, still seeking to circumvent the rival Protesters. The sudden turn of events soon brought another and an older rival into the field—Episcopacy. In the beginning of

February 1660, Douglas, Dickson, and the other leaders, "Resolutioner bishops," met in Edinburgh and deputed the diplomatic Sharp as their delegate to Monk. He reported regularly to Douglas, "the man most respected of all," as Baillie honourably entitles him. On the 31st March Douglas wrote to Sharp regretting "that a generation had arisen in Scotland unacquainted with the work of the Reformation, and consequently disposed to condemn even the Covenant itself, to which they bore a heart hatred : " and again, on the 26th April, he complains that "the generality of this new upstart generation have no love to Presbyterial government, but are wearied of that yoke, feeding themselves with the fancy of Episcopacy or moderate Episcopacy." Sharp was then busy interviewing Monk, members of Parliament, and Presbyterian ministers in London. Early in May he went to the king at Breda. While Douglas was urging Sharp to press on the king the covenanted uniformity of religion between the two nations, Sharp had to report, what was the sober truth, that the tide of Episcopacy had already begun to overflow England. As yet there was no hint that the tide might flow farther ; but all depended, said Sharp, upon the king's humour. The Resolutioners now began to moderate their demands. Episcopacy might do for England—that was the business of the English Presbyterians, as Douglas remarked—but Scotland must have her Covenants.¹

On the 29th May 1660 Charles entered London, and on the 19th June Edinburgh followed the southern capital in its rejoicings over the King's Restoration. It was celebrated with bonfires and barrels of wine, and with the exhibition of an effigy of Cromwell pursued by an effigy of the devil, the former being finally blown into the air from the Castle hill, to the delight of some thousands of

¹ Wodrow, *History* i. 4-54.

spectators. The historic Janet Geddes figured on this festive occasion at a bonfire near the Tron church, burning her "chair of state and all her creels, baskets, creepies, and fums." The other Scottish towns followed the lead of the metropolis in their manifestations of loyalty.

The thread of negotiations was resumed in London. On the 14th June Sharp had an interview with Charles, at which the king expressed his intention to preserve the established ecclesiastical order in Scotland, and to call an Assembly as soon as public affairs would permit. On 31st August Sharp returned to Scotland, bringing a letter from the king addressed to Douglas, to be communicated to the Edinburgh presbytery, which met on 3rd September. The king said in this letter—"We do resolve to protect and preserve the government of the Church of Scotland as it is settled by law, without violation, and to countenance in the due exercise of their functions all such ministers who shall behave themselves dutifully and peaceably." He also promised to call an Assembly and to send for Douglas and other ministers to confer with them on ecclesiastical affairs. The presbytery rejoiced, and ordered the royal letter to be enshrined in a silver box, and copies of it to be sent to all the presbyteries in Scotland. The Protesters had no faith in the letter, and told the Resolutioners they were bad grammarians to take the king's infinitive mood for the indicative. The sequel showed that they were right in their mistrust of the king.¹

The marquis of Argyll, who had gone to London in July to congratulate the king on his restoration, was seized and committed to the Tower. Orders were sent to apprehend other leading Protesters, including Warriston, who made his escape to France. The government was meanwhile entrusted to the committee of the Estates that had

¹ Kirkton, p. 75.

been appointed in 1651, the earls of Glencairn, Crawford, and Lauderdale being made respectively chancellor, treasurer, and secretary. General Middleton was nominated royal commissioner to the Parliament about to be summoned, and was created an earl for the occasion. He was a rough soldier of fortune, who had served under both the covenanting and the royalist flags, and was as destitute of political capacity as he was of moral principle. The committee met in Edinburgh on the 23rd August, and on the same day twelve of the leading Protesters, including Guthrie and Gillespie, framed what they called a "Supplication" to the king. It was couched in their usual dictatorial language, calling upon the king to "extirpate popery, prelacy, superstition," and so on—to fill all offices of trust in the three kingdoms with none but Covenanters—and to take away the ceremonies and Service Book from his own chapel and other places of his dominions. The committee arrested the Protesters, and warded them in the castle. Imagining that they had now the king and the government on their side, the Resolutioners proceeded to depose a number of the more violent Protesting ministers in several districts.¹

On the 1st January 1661 Parliament was opened by Middleton with a full house, and was busy passing Acts until the 12th July. It framed a new oath of allegiance requiring all members of Parliament, and persons holding offices of State, to acknowledge the king to be supreme over all persons and in all causes. It passed almost unanimously, on the 28th March, the famous Rescissory Act, which at one stroke repealed the legislation of the previous twenty-one years. This summary process of rescinding was similar to that adopted by the Glasgow

¹ Wodrow's *Hist.* i. 62-83; Baillie, iii. 446; Blair's *Life*, p. 357; Lamont's *Diary*, p. 158; Kirkton, p. 75.

Assembly in 1638, when it established the Presbyterian Church. By the Rescissory Act Presbytery ceased to be the polity of the Church, and Episcopacy was consequently restored to its former position as by law established. The nobles had now less reason to fear that any demand would be made upon them for the restitution of the episcopal lands, and their recent experiences made them welcome monarchy in the hope of repairing their shattered fortunes. A statute was passed at the same time, declaring the king's intention "to settle the government of the Church in such a frame as should be most agreeable to the Word of God, most suitable to monarchical government, and most complying with the public peace and quiet of the kingdom; and in the meantime permitting the present administration by sessions, presbyteries, and synods." Nothing was said of the General Assembly, which did not meet for thirty years to come.¹

One Scottish nobleman, prominent in many Parliaments, had no place in this—the marquis of Argyll. He was brought from the Tower in a ship of war to the castle of Edinburgh at the close of 1660, and in the February following was arraigned before Parliament for high treason. There was no denying many of the fourteen charges in his indictment, but most of them were as true of other statesmen, Monk, Middleton, and many more, as of Argyll; and it would have been well had even his treason been covered by the general Act of indemnity. Besides, even if the king had had no other cause for gratitude, his coronation at Scone by the hands of Argyll deserved a different reward. On the 25th May, when sentenced to death as a traitor, Argyll said quietly, "I had the honour to set the crown upon the king's head, and now he hastens me away to a better crown than his own." The marquis

¹ *Acts Parl. Scot.* vii. 3-367, and App. pp. 59, 78, 79, 81.

had entirely lost both his former popularity among his supporters and his immense wealth—the latter in ways not accounted for by historians. “Drowned in debt and obloquy” is the painful description of his closing years. The prospect of death seems to have given him a fortitude which he seldom showed in the battle-field of life. He was beheaded on the 27th May, and on his way to the scaffold he remarked—“I could die like a Roman, but I choose rather to die like a Christian.”¹

Another victim was James Guthrie, minister of Stirling, one of the most fanatical of the Protesters. He was the author of a seditious pamphlet called “The Causes of God’s Wrath,” and was otherwise obnoxious to the charge of treason. On these grounds he was condemned to be hanged on the 1st of June. One may have no sympathy with fanaticism like Guthrie’s, but the vindictive spirit of the government is much more to be condemned. A man less known, named Govan, was hanged at the same time as Guthrie. He was accused of having been on the scaffold when Charles I. was beheaded, but this was not proved. What was proved was his presence in arms among the Remonstrants of the west, and for this he suffered. Middleton himself had been in arms against monarchy. “The commissioner and I,” said the doomed man under the gibbet, “went out to the fields together for one cause. I have now the cord about my neck, and he is promoted to be his majesty’s commissioner, yet for a thousand worlds I would not change lots with him.” Warriston was also sentenced to death, and afterwards brought from France and executed. Rutherford was summoned before Parliament to answer for his treason, but on the 29th March he went to a higher tribunal. He had been

¹ *State Trials*, v. 1370-1507; 81-90; Wodrow, i. 130-158; Mac-Crookshank’s *History Ch. Scot.* i. kenzie’s *Memoirs*, pp. 34-47.

deprived of his office as principal of St. Mary's college in St. Andrews, and his democratic treatise *Lex Rex* was burned there by the public hangman. Another Protester, Patrick Gillespie, who had been principal of Glasgow University, and a thorn in the flesh to Baillie, who now succeeded him, saved himself by humiliating retractations.¹

Such were the reprisals for twenty years' merciless oppression under the Covenants. That there were some is hardly to be wondered at; that there were any is much to be deplored.

The different synods met and discussed the new ecclesiastical situation under the Rescissory Act. Those in the south and west protested, some mildly, others more strongly, against the setting up again of "prelatic Episcopacy"; while in the north, where the Covenants had never been popular, the great body of the people welcomed its restoration. The synod of Aberdeen petitioned the king to settle the ecclesiastical government "according to the Word of God and the practice of the ancient primitive Church, in such a way as might be most consistent with the royal authority, and most conducive to godliness, unity, peace, and order."²

On 5th September 1661 there was laid before the Scottish Privy Council a letter from the king, in which he referred to his previous communication to the presbytery of Edinburgh, dated August 1660. In that earlier letter the king's word was pledged to maintain "the government of the Church as settled by law," which on any fair construction meant the Presbyterian Church; and it is difficult to understand why a reference was made to the letter now when he was violating his solemn engagement under it.

¹ *Acts Parl. Scot.* vii. 34 *seq.*; Wodrow, *Hist.* i. 159-196, 204-217; Baillie, iii. 447; Lamont's *Diary*, p. 159; *Life of Blair*, p. 336.

² Wodrow, *Hist.* i. 109-130; Baillie, iii. 458-460; Nicoll's *Diary*, p. 333; Lamont's *Diary*, pp. 167-168.

If he had found reasons for changing his policy, those reasons should have been honestly stated ; but to refer to his previous pledge, as if he were now honourably redeeming it, was to insult his Presbyterian subjects, to shake public confidence in his sincerity, and to prejudice the country against the Episcopal polity. Many things show that a moderate constitutional Episcopacy never had a chance in Scotland under the Stuarts, and the action of Charles II. on this occasion is one of them. There will appear too many other circumstances, that point the same moral, in the dismal and deplorable history of the next thirty years.¹

¹ Cook, iii. 230 ; and for Sharp's correspondence see Wodrow's Introduction to *History of the Sufferings*, and the Lauderdale Papers. Many of Sharp's Letters in 1660-1661 are

to Mr. Patrick Drummond, a minister in London. See Article in *North British Review*, June 1867, on the correspondence.

CHAPTER XVI

CHARLES II.—FROM RESTORATION OF EPISCOPACY, 1661 TO 1670

Policy adopted in selecting the bishops—Sharp, Fairfoul, Hamilton, and Leighton—Their history and character—Ordination of two and consecration of the four in Westminster—Welcome of the bishops in Edinburgh—Filling of other sees—Parliament ratifies establishment of Episcopal Church—Bishops take their seats in Parliament—Collation to benefices by bishops—Meeting of diocesan synods—Style of worship in Episcopal Church established—Removal of non-conforming ministers—Character of their substitutes, the “curates”—Dr. Burnet, bishop of Aberdeen—Rivalry of Middleton and Lauderdale—Middleton superseded by Rothes—Severe Act of Parliament, the “Mile Act,” against outed ministers—New bishops—High Court of Commission set up—Persecution of Covenanters—Leighton’s pacific policy—Gilbert Burnet, the historian—His charges against the bishops—Leighton in Dunblane—Covenanters goaded into insurrection—Fight at Rullion Green—Hanging and banishment of Covenanters—Overtures for conciliation—Attempt on the primate’s life—Embitterment of Covenanters against the primate—Indulgences offered, 1667, 1669—Archbishop Burnet and the Covenanters—Burnet in trouble with Privy Council, and Sharp with the Parliament—Assertory Act—Expulsion of archbishop Burnet.

THE next step, after the re-establishment of Episcopacy, was the selection of ministers for the bishoprics. Sydserv was the only survivor of the old succession, and he could not be overlooked, were it only as a link of continuity with the episcopate of James’s reign. He was not reinstated in Galloway, his former see, but appointed to Orkney, which had now the advantage of being better endowed than

many of the Scottish bishoprics.¹ The question is said to have been raised whether or not the other sees should be filled by clergymen who had consistently adhered to Episcopacy during the Covenants. That policy, at all events, was not adopted. Ministers chosen chiefly from the Resolutioners were to be the rulers of the Scottish Church. The plan was as plausible as eventually it proved unsuccessful. No doubt fourteen men could have been found among the Resolutioners with qualifications for the Episcopal office that would have commanded the respect of the country, and might in time have won the confidence of the moderate Presbyterians. But such men were not likely to be found—at least few such were found—by the dark lantern of the king's prerogative.

James Sharp, minister of Crail, was appointed to the primacy; Andrew Fairfoul, minister of Duns, to the archiepiscopal see of Glasgow; James Hamilton, minister of Cambusnethan, to Galloway; and Robert Leighton, principal of Edinburgh University, to Dunblane. These nominations were made towards the close of the year 1661, the writ for Sharp's appointment to St. Andrews passing the great seal on the 14th of November. The other sees were filled in the following year.

Leighton and Sharp were as different in temperament and character as any two men could be. They were the light and shade of the new episcopate. Other considerations apart, they were both able men, with natural gifts and learning which would have won them a prominent place in the hierarchy of any Church.² The same cannot be said of their two colourless compeers. Hamilton was

¹ Some of the English sees were each worth in emoluments all the Scottish sees put together, barely £5000 a year.

² Sharp had a distinguished Uni-

versity career, became regent of St. Leonards, minister of Crail, and professor of divinity in St. Mary's college, St. Andrews.

neither learned nor brilliant, but he was the brother of lord Belhaven, which probably accounts for his ecclesiastical elevation, as similar reasons have accounted for preferments in other times and sees. Fairfoul's appointment has no explanation, and his feeble administration of the western arch-diocese only increases the wonder how he got there.¹ He had a reputation for facetiousness, which the serious-minded Leighton thought sometimes out of season. The reproach thrown at him for having signed the Covenant against his conscience he parried with the jest that "there were some very good medicines which must be swallowed at once without being chewed."²

Sharp's is one of the most debatable characters in history—"the bishop of debate." He has been blackened and whitened and blackened again until the process seems interminable. A dispassionate examination of the evidence leaves him, in the writer's judgment, neither so black nor so white as he has been painted. He never at any time appears a lovable man, though honest Baillie loved, admired, and trusted him as long as he deserved to be trusted, and perhaps a little longer. The evidence points to his having been a worldly-minded and ambitious ecclesiastic, a dexterous diplomatist, fertile in resources nicely calculated to one end—the advancement of James Sharp. This is not the material out of which to make saint or martyr, or even a respectable bishop.³ But, admitting

¹ Kirkton has a good word for his scholarship, and coming from that quarter it may be credited.

² Burnet's *History*, i. 146.

³ Dr. Grub in the interleaved copy of his *History* remarks—"Among the ministers the feelings were various so far as opposed to the Covenant. Some like Leighton and his friends disliked it, and thought Episcopacy would protect them from its tyranny. Some

like Sharp and Honeyman acted on mixed motives of dislike to the Covenant and personal ambition. Many like Fairfoul never liked it, but were indifferent. Others like Ramsay and Scougal were ready to become sincere converts to Episcopacy, and others like the majority of the Aberdeen synod now openly avowed the principles they had always held."

so much, it is still a long way from the conclusion that he was a double-dyed traitor, the Judas of the Presbyterian cause, which is the verdict of one class of historians.¹ Sharp was one of the Resolutioners, the moderate school of that day, which comprised the majority of Presbyterians and many Episcopalians ; and few among them had any decided opinions as to the divine right of either Presbytery or Episcopacy. With most of them Church government was a question not of principle but of expediency. This has to be remembered in the case of Sharp as well as of Leighton, who, at least in his early days, held on this subject the same lax views, as many would now regard them. Sharp was the more pronounced Presbyterian of the two, as shown by his stickling for the validity of Presbyterian orders at Westminster, when the more liberal Leighton agreed without any scruple to be ordained deacon and priest before his consecration. It is true that Sharp, when delegate for the Presbyterians, repeatedly wrote, as the cause of Presbytery became less and less promising, that he hoped Episcopacy would not be imposed upon Scotland. And it is equally clear that so long as the battle was not hopeless he fought honestly for Presbyterianism ; and there is, moreover, good reason for believing that it was chiefly his advocacy which postponed the settlement of Church polity for a whole year. He was not the man, however, to champion a lost cause, and sacrifice himself in its ruins ; but it is more than the evidence warrants to say that he betrayed his trust, or that any other person in his place could have saved Presbyterianism at the Restoration.

Up to this point Sharp's conduct can be vindicated as sincere and consistent. Beyond this, it seems im-

¹ See Dr. Cunningham's *Hist. Ch. Scot.* ii. 217 ; and Dr. Rankin, *Church of Scot.* ed. Story, ii. 546.

possible to defend it on impartial lines. When the battle was lost, he did not simply accept the defeat, but suddenly exchanged his position as the advocate and representative of the now discredited Church, for that of the highest dignitary in the prelatie Church he had been commissioned to oppose. That was the head and front of Sharp's offending, and no special pleading can justify it. No honourable man in Sharp's position, and with his past record, could have accepted the archbishopric of St. Andrews. His place should have been by the side of Douglas and Baillie, both of whom, Douglas certainly, might have been bishops but for their conscientious adherence to Presbytery. It is said¹ that Douglas was offered the primacy by the king, that Sharp was the bearer of the offer, and that it was declined with the remark—"I see, James, you are clear, you will engage, you will be bishop of St. Andrews; take it, and the curse of God with it." What is more certain is that Douglas was offered the bishopric of Edinburgh, which was kept vacant for some time in the hope of his accepting it.²

It is sometimes forgotten that Sharp did greatly more harm to Episcopacy by adopting it than he did to Presbytery by deserting it. He could not but know that his acceptance of the primacy would blacken Episcopacy in the eyes of many of his countrymen; and the policy he afterwards pursued, in fostering Erastianism and abetting the persecution of the Covenanters, has discredited Episcopacy among Scotsmen for the last two hundred years. Sharp proved one of the worst of the many doubtful friends that Episcopacy had in that troubled century.

Leighton's character is one of the redeeming features

¹ Kirkton, p. 135; Wodrow, *Analecta*, iii. 82, 83.

² Douglas afterwards accepted an "Indulgence," and became a minister

under Episcopacy, but that was a different thing from accepting a bishopric immediately after the discomfiture of Presbyterianism.

in the Church of the Restoration. He was born in 1611, educated in Edinburgh University and on the Continent, where he learned to appreciate the devotional side of Catholic literature. As the son of the famous Nonconformist who suffered so much in the time of Laud, chiefly for his treatise *Zion's Plea against Prelacy*, he might well have been weaned from any sympathy with Episcopacy, but his own experience of the intolerance and bigotry of the Covenanters turned his heart against them. He was ordained Presbyterian minister in 1641 to the parish of Newbattle, where he wrote his sermons and commentaries, and in 1653 he resigned the charge from dislike of the Protester faction.¹ Shortly afterwards he became principal of Edinburgh University, and held office until the Restoration, when he accepted, of his own choice, the smallest and poorest of Scottish bishoprics—Dunblane.² It says much for the restored episcopate that it enlisted the services of a man of his high character for learning and piety, as well as for charity and tolerance. The acceptance of a bishopric expressed his belief that "the more excellent way" for that age lay in a moderate constitutional Episcopacy. Had Leighton's plan been adopted by the rulers in Church and State he would not have laboured in vain, and the history of those times would have borne a different complexion. No saintlier soul than Robert Leighton ever adorned the episcopate in Scotland. He has been happily described as "the Fénelon of the Scottish Church"; and Burnet, speaking of the excellence of his doctrinal teaching, says that "his own practice did even outshine his doctrine." The misfortune for the country was that he was unequally yoked together with a body of bishops, the

¹ In Brodie's *Diary*, p. 42, an interesting conversation is recorded between Leighton and Brodie in

May 1653.

² Dalziel's *History Univ. Edinburgh*, ii. 166.

majority of whom were not worthy of his fellowship, nor of the sacred office to which they had been appointed.

The four bishops-elect were summoned to London in December to receive consecration. Hamilton and Fairfoul had been ordained by the Scottish bishops of the former line; Sharp and Leighton by the Presbyterians. The Anglican bishops, imbued by the higher teaching of the Caroline divines, questioned the validity of Presbyterian orders, and insisted upon Sharp and Leighton being ordained to the diaconate and priesthood before their consecration. Sharp objected, and pleaded the precedent of 1610 when reordination was not insisted upon; Leighton made no scruple.¹ As the English bishops were firm, Sharp had to yield. The four prelates were then consecrated in Westminster Abbey on 15th December 1661 by the bishops of London, Worcester, Carlisle, and Llandaff.²

Before the bishops returned to Scotland the Scots Privy Council received a letter from the king withdrawing his previous sanction of presbyteries and synods, and forbidding them to meet until summoned by the diocesan bishops. It was one more breach of the royal faith; but bishops having been appointed, it was only fair that their authority should be supported. Leighton was already busy with his scheme of a modified episcopacy, and sounded the two archbishops. Sharp was diplomatic, and Fairfoul was jocular, and between the two, as Burnet says, the peacemaker got little encouragement.

The bishops left London in April 1662, travelling home together in the primate's coach, said to have been newly purchased for the occasion. Leighton, on learning that a public reception was awaiting them in Edinburgh,

¹ See what Sharp said as to the English bishops, Brodie's *Diary*, p. 201.

² Burnet, i. 237, 238; Wilkin; *Concilia*, iv. 573, 574.

parted company with his brethren at Morpeth, as tired of them, he says, as they probably were of him. Many of the nobles, gentry, and burgesses met the three prelates as they approached Edinburgh to give them a welcome, and they were afterwards banqueted by the commissioner and chancellor. Sharp had a weakness for parade, and the primacy afforded him opportunities for its display. On taking possession of his ancient see on the 16th April, he rode from Leslie to St. Andrews with an earl on each side of him, and a train of seven or eight hundred mounted gentlemen. In vain was Scottish history written for James Sharp.¹

The nine vacant sees had now to be filled. Dr. Wishart, a native of Angus, was appointed to Edinburgh. He was a scholarly and kind-hearted man, who had been deprived of his charge in St. Andrews by the Covenanters, and had suffered many hardships, including imprisonment, at their hands, all of which he repaid with charity when he was bishop and had the means of befriending them. He was a staunch royalist, and had been chaplain to the great Montrose. Another man, still more distinguished for learning, David Mitchell, formerly minister in Edinburgh, was made bishop of Aberdeen.² He was the son of a farmer at Garvoch in the Mearns, and Angus and Mearns were both strongholds of Episcopacy. Like Wishart he had been driven during the Covenanting stress into England, where he was honoured with a doctor's degree from Oxford, and a prebend's stall in Westminster. He had been a personal friend of bishop William Forbes and bishop

¹ Baillie's *Letters*, iii. 485. "Scotland was now as much alienated by the cruelty of the Covenanters as England had been from Popery at the accession of Elizabeth. Equally good results might have followed had a primate been chosen for Scotland

as wise and learned as Parker."—Dr. Grub, MS. interleaved copy of *History*.

² Mitchell was originally a Puritan. See Introduction to Sprot's *Liturgies*, p. xlv.

Maxwell, and was of their school in theology. No more suitable appointment could have been made to the bishopric of Aberdeen, the honoured seat of learning, and the home of unbroken Episcopal traditions.

The other seven bishops appointed were—George Haliburton, minister at Perth, to Dunkeld ; Murdoch M'Kenzie, minister at Elgin, to Moray ; Patrick Forbes, son of John Forbes, the exiled minister of Alford, to Caithness ; John Paterson, minister at Aberdeen, to Ross ; David Strachan, minister at Fettercairn, to Brechin ; David Fletcher, formerly minister at Edinburgh, to Argyll ; and Robert Wallace, minister at Barnwell in Ayrshire, to the Isles. These were all Resolutioners, and Dr. Grub certifies that they were men "of respectable character, but not one among them was remarkable for learning or ability."¹ Their selection is credited, probably enough, to Sharp ; but the primate, with his now damaged reputation, was not the man to attract the leading Resolutioners into his camp. The Resolutioners did not elect their leaders ; they made themselves in the free and open conflict of public life, where ability and learning found their proper place, as they do on the whole among the Presbyterian leaders of the present day. Herein lay the great weakness of Episcopacy as contrasted with Presbytery, that its rulers, the prerogative bishops, were not chosen by natural selection, nor by survival of the fittest, but by favour of the Court or that of some powerful patron. Of all the fourteen bishops upon whom, under the *régime* of episcopal autocracy as then constituted, the success or failure of the newly-established Church mainly depended, there were, putting aside Sharp, only three men, namely, Leighton, Mitchell, and Wishart, who brought to their sacred office

¹ Brodie, in his *Diary*, pp. 276, 277, gives a poor opinion of the new bishop of Moray.

the qualifications that would have made Episcopacy successful and honoured. They were only three to eleven, and among the eleven were the two archbishops.

The Parliament which met in May 1662, under Middleton, passed an Act for "the restitution and re-establishment of the ancient government of the Church by archbishops and bishops," who were to be reinstated in the powers possessed previously to 1638, and to govern the Church "with the advice and assistance of such of the clergy as they should find to be of known loyalty and prudence." Few traces are to be found of the influence of the presbyterate in the government of the Church during its establishments in this century, and still fewer in its disestablished condition in the next century. It was all along a suicidal system of misgovernment, a combination of regal despotism and episcopal autocracy, with which constitutional churchmen can have no sympathy.

After the Act for the restoration of episcopal government had passed, the bishops were invited to take their seats in Parliament as one of the Three Estates. A deputation of two nobles, two barons, two burgesses, waited upon them at the primate's lodgings in the Netherbow, and conducted them with much ceremony to the Parliament House, where they took the oaths and their seats. By another statute, of the 27th May, the king claimed the right, as inherent in the royal prerogative, to order the external polity of the Church, with the advice of the bishops and such of the clergy as his majesty might consult. A more important Act followed on the 11th June, affecting the law of patronage as to Church benefices. The Parliament of 1649 had abolished patronage, and the Assembly had vested the right of election in the kirk-session, with power to the congregation to appeal to the presbytery. This law was operative from 1649 to 1660. It was now decreed

that all ministers elected during this interval should seek presentation from the lawful patron, and collation from the diocesan bishop before the 20th September. There was no difficulty in the way of applicants, so far as patron and bishop were concerned. The difficulties were on the other side. Any such application involved a twofold admission: first, that the previous tenure of office was irregular; and second, that the authority of bishops was lawful. Many of the ministers were prepared to dispute both points.

The diocesan synods held in October were another testing ordeal. In the north they were well attended by the ministers;¹ in the southern and western dioceses it was different. Of two hundred and forty ministers in the diocese of Glasgow only about thirty were present, and in Argyll and Galloway there were none but the deans. In St. Andrews the primate enjoined the clergy to use in public worship the doxology and the Lord's prayer, and in baptism the apostles' creed. Bishop Wishart in his synod ordered the same, and recommended daily prayer in town churches, and in all places where two or three could be gathered together.² Leighton went further and urged upon the clergy the reading of a chapter from both the Old and New Testaments and some of the Psalms at each service, the regular catechising of the young and ignorant throughout the whole year, daily public prayer in churches, which the people were to be earnestly invited to attend, plain practical preaching and no controversy, the clergy to be lovers of peace and "always more studious of pacific than polemic divinity." Bishop Mitchell recommended in

¹ Brodie, writing on 24th October, says he heard that all the ministers of Moray except two had submitted to the bishop. See his *Diary*, pp. 278, 279, 298.

² See as to Edinburgh diocesan synod *Calendar of State Papers* (Domestic Series, Reign of Charles II.), 1661-62, p. 520.

his Aberdeen diocese the revival of "readers" in each congregation, and the use of the Psalm Book, the rehearsal of the creed, the reading of the ten commandments—mentioning the places in his diocese where daily morning and evening prayer was to be said publicly in church.

It may be convenient to state here what were the creed and the worship of the Episcopal Church during its establishment from 1661 to 1689. The Scriptures and the apostles' creed were practically the only rule of faith. There was no liturgy used in the public worship, except in one or two places—in the chapel-royal, Holyrood, at intervals, and in the parish church of Salton under Gilbert Burnet. With no liturgy and no surplice, the service differed in no material respect from Presbyterian usage. It was a charitable accommodation, wise or unwise, to the prejudice of that age against "forms of worship." And yet we have the curious paradox, that Presbyterians under the Covenants had a liturgy—Knox's Book—while the Episcopal Church established had none. This much, then, is clear—that the opposition to Episcopacy was not provoked by surplice, liturgy, or ritual in the parish churches. The service must have been as bare as any Covenanter could in his heart have desired it, and much more so than most Presbyterians would now tolerate.¹

When Middleton, the commissioner, went to Glasgow in the end of September, he found that few of the ministers in the west country, appointed between 1649

¹ See Sir George Mackenzie's Vindication of Charles Second's Government, *Works*, ii. 343. Sir George writes—"We had no ceremonies, surplice, altar, cross in baptism, nor the meanest of those things which would be allowed in England by the Dissenters in way of accommodation."

Speaking of the church where he attended he adds—"The way of worship in our church differed nothing from what the Presbyterians themselves practised, excepting only that we used the doxology, the Lord's prayer, and, in baptism, the creed."

and 1660, had applied for fresh presentations. A Council was accordingly held in Glasgow, which forbade the non-conforming ministers to officiate, and ordered their removal from their parishes, and from the bounds of presbyteries, before the 1st November.¹ It was also agreed to subject the ministers to the legal penalties prescribed for non-observance of the 29th May as a holiday in honour of the Restoration.

The Privy Council expected by its severity to frighten the western ministers into compliance. It had an opposite effect. For once primate Sharp was on the side of conciliation,² and another Act was passed at Edinburgh on 23rd December extending the time of indulgence to the 1st February. Several ministers took advantage of this Act and received institution to their charges, but a large number, variously estimated at from two to three hundred, refused to sacrifice their convictions and were deprived.³

The same difficulty was now experienced in filling so many vacant charges as the Covenanters had experienced in finding substitutes for the Episcopal clergy expelled in 1638. Young men, chiefly from the northern dioceses, where Episcopacy was strongest, were called to fill the places hitherto occupied by ministers who had endeared themselves to the people by faithful services. It was not to be expected that the episcopal novices would be acceptable pastors to the western flocks, but the stories of Kirkton and Wodrow as to the vileness of the

¹ See afterwards, p. 362, note, what Leighton said of this drastic order.

² Kirkton says that "no man was more dissatisfied" than the archbishop at the ejection of the younger Presbyterian preachers.—*Hist.* pp. 149-150.

³ "The fact that nearly 600 or-

ained Presbyterian ministers at once conformed to Episcopacy, conclusively shows that the yoke imposed by the rulers of the Covenanting Church in the time of their supremacy had been uneasily borne." Rev. Dr. Milroy in Story's ed. *Church of Scot.* iv. 241.

"curates," as the peasantry called them, must be accepted with the proverbial grain of salt.¹

The legislation which compelled the ministers to accept a fresh presentation and collation was highly impolitic. Had they been required to accept Episcopal ordination, it were easy to understand the principle involved; but merely to force collation at a bishop's hand and send the men back to their parishes was as superfluous as it was provocative. Leighton's plan was the wiser. If these ministers were to be accepted, it should have been done with a good will, and without galling restrictions, trusting to time and patient dealing for the healing of the breach.

In the beginning of 1663 Dr. Mitchell, bishop of Aberdeen, died, and was succeeded by Dr. Alexander Burnet, of whom we shall hear more on his translation to Glasgow.² Burnet was ordained in England during the Covenanting struggle, and while the Commonwealth lasted he officiated on the Continent. He was consecrated at St. Andrews in September of this year.

The rivalry between the earls of Middleton and Lauderdale, and their efforts to undermine each other, ended in the recall and disgrace of Middleton, who was no match for his opponent in political intrigue. The earl of Rothes, son of the earl known as "father of the Covenant," replaced him as commissioner. Both father and son were bad men, but with this difference, that the father cloaked his vices under the garb of hypocrisy,

¹ Burnet, in his *History*, i. 268, 269, gives them a bad character, but in his earlier work, *Vindication of Authority of Church and State in Scotland*, his language is much more favourable. See afterwards for Burnet's change of opinion. Wodrow, i. 281-286, 324-336; Kirkton, pp. 149-152, 160-163;

Life of Robert Blair, pp. 423-432; Mackenzie, pp. 77, 78; Professor Flint, *St. Giles' Lectures*, First Series, p. 207.

² His father was an Episcopal clergyman deposed by the Covenanters in 1639.

while the son made no secret of his. Young Rothes was the tool of Lauderdale, who came with him to Scotland in the summer of 1663. The political change was welcomed by the Presbyterians, who had as yet no reason to suspect the character of Lauderdale, and they could not forget that he had been one of their lay champions in the Westminster Assembly.

Some of the extruded ministers continued to live in their old parishes and to preach in field conventicles, denouncing the Government, the bishops, and the "curates," in no measured terms. Crowds flocked to hear them, and in some parishes the church was deserted. One false step begets another. Parliament met in June 1663, and passed an Act by which deprived ministers were forbidden to exercise their ministry under pain of being charged with sedition; and all parishioners were ordered to attend their parish church under penalty of heavy fines for absence. A laird was to be fined a fourth of his yearly rental, a tenant the fourth of his movables, and every burgess a like proportion, besides the forfeiture of his privilege of trading. By a natural oversight women were not named in the Act, but this was afterwards remedied by making husbands responsible for their wives' attendance on ordinances. The sense of wrong did not suppress the sense of humour in the western folks, who nicknamed the statute "The bishops' drag-net." The westerns might jest but the Privy Council was in earnest. It passed in August "The Mile Act," which required that no recusant minister should live within twenty miles of his former parish, within six miles of Edinburgh or any other cathedral city, or within three miles of a burgh town. The punishment under the statute was the same as for sedition.¹

¹ Kirkton, p. 150; Wodrow. i. 341, where the Act is given.

Some changes that require to be noted occurred this year in the episcopate. Sydserf of Orkney died in September, at Edinburgh, and was succeeded by Honeyman, archdeacon of St. Andrews, who had been formerly a strenuous advocate of Presbyterian polity.¹ Archbishop Fairfoul also died in Edinburgh, and was succeeded early in 1664 by Dr. Burnet, translated from Aberdeen to Glasgow. Patrick Scougal, minister at Salton, whom Baillie in 1658 described as "a good and noble scholar," followed Dr. Burnet in the see of Aberdeen.² Another Burnet—Gilbert, followed Scougal in the parish of Salton.

The primate's ambition was gratified by receiving, in January 1664, a royal letter which gave him precedence of the chancellor and of all other subjects in Scotland. He was now on a footing with the primate of all England, but it is said by Burnet (Gilbert the historian) that, not satisfied with his new pre-eminence, he sought the office of chancellor on the death of lord Glencairn in May of this year. If so, happily he did not succeed; and his paltry ambition for precedence was altogether unseemly in the distracted state of the Church.³

The king at the same time signed an order for the restoration of the High Court of Commission to deal with ecclesiastical offences. By a specious show of impartiality the Court was to deal with "all popish traffickers, inter-communers with and resettlers of Jesuits and seminary priests; all who say or hear mass; all keepers of conventicles; all ministers who remain in or intrude themselves upon parishes from which they have been inhibited; all who keep meetings at fasts, and administer

¹ Honeyman and Scougal were consecrated at St. Andrews in April 1664.—*Fasti, Eccles. Scot.* v. 459.

² Scougal was elected professor of Divinity in Edinburgh University in

December 1662, upon Dickson's resignation, but apparently did not accept office.—Dalziel's, *Hist. Univ. Ed.* ii. 189, 355.

³ Burnet, i. 355-361.

the Lord's supper, which are not approven by authority ; all who speak, preach, write, or print to the scandal, reproach, or detriment of the estate or government of the Church or Kingdom as now established"—with much more to the same effect. On the Commission were the two archbishops, seven bishops, the chancellor, the treasurer, and several noblemen, barons, judges, and burgesses—in all forty-five members, any five of their number, including a prelate, to be a quorum. The High Courts in the two previous reigns had not been so successful that the experiment need have been repeated now. But it was of a piece with much of the ill-advised ecclesiastical legislation of this reign. In less than two years the Court died a silent death, lamented by nobody.¹

Whether through the Privy Council or through the revived High Court, the Government showed that they meant to strike as well as to threaten. From 1664 to 1666 persecution reigned in the south-west ; fines were imposed, and rough soldiers quartered upon the people to dragoon them into a liking for Episcopacy. Nothing so grotesque had been attempted in the name of religion, except perhaps when Covenanters had used similar weapons to coerce Episcopalians to subscribe the Solemn League and Covenant, or when, still earlier, Protestants had ruined and imprisoned Roman Catholic priests and laymen for saying or hearing mass. It is uncertain how far the Government, and how far the bishops were responsible for these persecutions. Wodrow states that nothing was done except at the instigation of the bishops ; but Dr. Grub remarks² that "numberless as are the passages in which this is averred or implied, he (Wodrow) seldom gives any evidence that such was the case."

¹ Wodrow, i. 384-395 ; Kirkton, pp. 205-211 ; Burnet, i. 356 ; *Life of Robert Blair*, pp. 463 *seq.*

² *Eccles. Hist.* iii. 222.

One bishop at least may be cleared of the stain of persecution. The saintly Leighton, weary of religious strife, and disappointed in his day-dream of the Church of the Reconciliation, which he fondly hoped Episcopacy would usher in, intimated to his clergy in his diocesan synod, October 1665, that he meant to resign his see. With this intention he went to London and tendered his resignation to the king, telling him plainly that he could not concur in the violent measures adopted in Scotland, not even for the planting of the Christian religion itself, much less for a form of Church government. Upon the king's assurance that a milder policy would be substituted Leighton was induced to return to his diocese.¹

The works of Gilbert Burnet have been cited in these pages, and as he now comes in person upon the stage of our history something may be said of his career. He was the son of Robert Burnet of Crimond, one of many exiles to the Continent—bishop Sydserf his friend was another—driven from Scotland by the Covenants. Gilbert was born in 1643, educated at Marischal college, Aberdeen, and licensed as a probationer at the age of eighteen. Before accepting the benefice of Salton in Midlothian, which he did in 1665, he travelled in England and on the Continent.² He had also in his precocity remonstrated with both Sharp and Lauderdale on their ill-advised persecutions, gaining, he says, no goodwill from the primate for his youthful officiousness. He was ordained by the bishop of Edinburgh and became a model parish priest, diligent in preaching and in visiting, and successful also in establishing the use of the English Prayer Book in his church with the approval of his people, a reform, it is probable, nowhere else accomplished at this time in

¹ Burnet, i. 367, 368; Leighton's *Works*, iv. 397-398.

² Fasti, *Eccles. Scot.* i. 355.

Scotland. His parish was, however, too small a sphere for his activities, and he continued to give unsolicited advice to his seniors and superiors. The worldliness and lukewarmness of the bishops, he says, provoked him to remonstrance. He signed and circulated a paper, sending a copy to each of the bishops, charging them with departure from the pattern of the primitive Church, neglecting their spiritual duties, intermeddling with secular affairs, spending the revenues of the Church upon their families, and, above all, persecuting cruelly those who differed from them.¹ The primate felt most aggrieved by Burnet's attack, and was very indignant with the writer. He would have summarily deposed him, and when the other bishops objected, he left them in high dudgeon. Burnet was then called into the bishops' presence, and in a fatherly way admonished by Dr. Scougal for his indiscretion.²

What truth was in Burnet's charges is left to conjecture, but they could hardly have been so boldly asserted without some foundation. It is to be regretted on historical grounds that Burnet so heartily hated both arch-bishops as to beget mistrust of his statements respecting them. As bishop of Salisbury under William III., and the warm advocate of that sovereign's ecclesiastical policy, all that he subsequently wrote of his mother Church in the north is tinged with a deep Orange colour and must be read with caution. In 1669 he was made professor of divinity in Glasgow, and there for the present we leave him.

Bishop Leighton continued his pacific policy in Dunblane, assiduous in his efforts to elevate the standard

¹ Another account derived through bishop Scougal, who was friendly to Burnet, gives a slightly different colour to the charges.

² Burnet, i. 373-375.

of public worship and the morals of his clergy and people. He had introduced a new style of preaching, less diffuse and tedious, more simple and practical. In his diocesan synod, held in October 1666, he recommended the clergy to prefer long texts and short sermons to the short texts and long sermons then in vogue, which wearied more than they edified the hearers. He advised them also to read the Scriptures without note or comment, reminding them that with all their zeal against popery they were too much of the Romish opinion that the Word of God could not be safely trusted to speak for itself without continual exposition. He condemned the people's practice of sitting at prayer, and charged the clergy to exhort them either to kneel or to stand as befitting their presence in God's House. He gave injunctions also for the more frequent celebration of Holy Communion, the neglect of which was, in the bishop's belief, the chief defect in the worship of the Scottish Church. As dean of the chapel royal, Holyrood, Leighton delighted in the service of the Anglican Prayer Book, which was there in use. But all that he sought to enforce in his diocese was the use of the Lord's prayer, the doxology, and the creed, with the repetition of the ten commandments—a meagre enough instalment of liturgic worship.

We turn now from Leighton and the peaceful seclusion of Dunblane to the stormy and troubled west. The folly of the Government had driven the Covenanters into resistance, and at last to insurrection. Sir James Turner, a rough soldier of fortune, was despatched with troops to enforce obedience. Like many other adventurers of the period Turner had been trained in the wars of Germany, and had returned to serve in the Covenanting armies, which he did down to the time of the "Engagement" with Charles the First, when he left the Covenanters and joined

the royalists. He now marched westward with his troops, quartered them upon the people, and began the process of coercion by fines and cesses, which he exacted, as the records show, in a merciless manner.¹ An aged peasant in Dalry, Galloway, had been apprehended for non-payment of Church fines, and was being carried off by the soldiers, when four men, sympathisers with the peasantry, rescued the captive and wounded a soldier. This trivial incident was the signal for a general "rising." The insurgents marched to Dumfries and made a prisoner of Turner, and in increasing numbers made for the capital by way of Lanark, where they halted and renewed the Covenant. Here they mustered about two thousand strong, of foot and horse, but before they reached the Pentlands their numbers had gradually dwindled to nine hundred. General Dalziel was sent after them, overtook them at Rullion Green near the Pentlands, and there, on the afternoon of "a fair frosty day," the 28th November, the undisciplined Covenanters were completely routed. Forty-five were slain, and about a hundred taken prisoners, of whom more than thirty were hanged in detachments, and the rest banished. Seventeen were hanged in Edinburgh, and other sixteen in Glasgow, Irvine, Ayr, and Dumfries to strike terror into "the rebellious west." Among the prisoners were Neilson of Corsock, and a young preacher, Hugh M'Kail. Both of them before being hung were barbarously tortured to extort a confession, it being suspected that the insurrection was fostered by the Dutch government, then at war with Britain. One unexpected feature was revealed in course of this armed rising—the dislike of the Lothian peasantry and the Edinburgh citizens to the "wild western Whigs," as the Covenanters were now called. The defeated Covenanters

¹ See Burton, vii. 169.

are said to have suffered more hurt at their hands than from Dalziel's soldiers. Times were changed in the capital from the day when the first Covenant was signed within the Greyfriars' Church in 1638.¹

It was an opportune moment for staying the persecution, and Burnet mentions that the best of the clergy pleaded with the bishops to intercede for the prisoners. The bishop of Edinburgh needed no persuasion to mercy; he had himself been a prisoner in the Tolbooth under the Covenant, and he now sent daily supplies of food from his table to the captive Covenanters. But the archbishops, Burnet says, had no bowels of mercy, and remained implacable. He even asserts that his namesake, the archbishop of Glasgow, advised that all should be executed who would not renounce the Covenant, and that he withheld, until after the death of M'Kail, a letter from the king, recommending mercy and no more shedding of blood. As the same story is told by Kirkton and Wodrow of the archbishop of St. Andrews, it may be charitably hoped that it is not true of either.²

Proposals were now made for a humaner policy, and the change of government at this time favoured it. Rothes, who is coupled with Sharp as an advocate of persecution, ceased to be commissioner, and the administration was placed in the hands of the earls of Tweeddale, Kincardine, and Argyll,³ who were as much averse to a policy of persecution as they were to the political influence of the two archbishops. Various schemes of accommodation were suggested for relieving the deprived ministers. They had an active supporter in Leighton, and as active an opponent in archbishop Burnet. Leighton went to

¹ See Burton, vii. 172.

² Burnet, i. 404-412; Kirkton, p. 255; Wodrow, ii. 17-59; Sir James Turner's *Memoirs*, pp. 139-189.

³ Argyll was the son of the late marquis, and had been restored to the earldom, not to the marquise.

London and advocated his proposals before the king. The Church, he suggested, should be governed by the bishops and clergy in their ecclesiastical courts, and in matters both of jurisdiction and ordination the bishops should be guided by the majority of their presbyters. Ministers who submitted to the bishops should only be required to do so in the interests of peace and without sacrificing principle. Provincial synods should be held every third year, or oftener at the king's summons, and in these synods the bishops might be censured for offences proved against them.¹ These proposals meant an encroachment upon Episcopal authority, but the welfare of the Church demanded some sacrifice, and as the leading bishops had manifestly abused the powers of their office, less regret might have been felt at their restriction. But the hope of remedy was frustrated by an attempt upon the life of the primate. The assassin's pistol or dagger has often stayed reforms; seldom has it advanced them. And so it was now. Archbishop Sharp, from being mistrusted and disliked, had become the object of fanatical hatred. All the woes of the Church, and all the blood that was being shed, were laid at his door, and desperate men vowed vengeance. On the 11th July 1668, as he was stepping into his carriage in Edinburgh, James Mitchell, a preacher who had been implicated in the late insurrection, fired a pistol at him. The bullet shattered the arm of bishop Honeyman who was beside the primate, and so probably his life was saved. In the confusion of the moment the assassin escaped, but his face haunted the primate for the next ten years.²

The proposals of 1667 to extend an Indulgence to the ejected ministers were renewed in 1669, and were partially successful. On the 7th June a royal letter was

¹ Grub, iii. 230.

² Kirkton, p. 279; Burnet's

History, i. 309; Wodrow, ii. 115, 116.

laid before the Council offering to ministers who would accept collation from the bishops and attend presbyteries and synods, the full fruits of their benefices.¹ Those who would not accept collation were to have the manse and glebe, and a smaller pecuniary stipend. Upwards of forty ministers, and among them Robert Douglas and George Hutchieson, accepted the Indulgence and were admitted, some to their old parishes and others to new ones. The compromise failed to give satisfaction to the zealots on either side. The high Episcopalians condemned it as an Erastian encroachment upon the rights of the episcopate, and the rigid Covenanters abused it as daubing the walls with untempered mortar. The indulged ministers, because they ceased to rail against prelacy, as they had done at conventicles, were now branded as "*king's* curates" and dumb dogs who had ceased to bark.

Archbishop Burnet was specially affected by the Act, most of the indulged ministers being in his diocese. At his synod in September, a strong remonstrance was framed for presentation to the Privy Council, protesting against the asserted prerogative of the crown as an usurpation of the rights of the Church. The Council retaliated by condemning the remonstrance as illegal and seditious, ordering Burnet meanwhile to retire to Glasgow, and sending a report of the proceedings to the Court, where they were regarded with little favour. Charles said there was nothing to choose between the Episcopal and the Presbyterian Remonstrants of the west.

Archbishop Sharp got into similar trouble. At a meeting of the Estates, held at Edinburgh in October, the primate in his sermon said there were three pretenders to

¹ Leighton, in a letter to Lauderdale, dated Edinburgh 16th June 1669, writes—"That which hath made the wound of our schism almost

incurable was the unhappy Act of Glasgow turning out so many ministers at once."—Letter in *Notes and Queries*, 22nd Feb. 1862, p. 144.

ecclesiastical supremacy, the pope, the king, and the General Assembly, whose claims were alike untenable. Had the Episcopate as a body been firm, and backed the protest of the two archbishops against the Erastian measures of the Government, and at the same time insisted upon a more tolerant policy towards nonconforming ministers, both the king and his Scots Council might have been held in check. The clergy would have supported them, and so would the bulk of the people, both Presbyterian and Episcopal. But the Scottish bishops were for the most part like the Psalmist's conies—"a feeble folk,"¹ and even Sharp was frightened at the report of his own sermon. The Council expressed their displeasure at his language, but having one recalcitrant archbishop already on their hands, no action was taken against the primate. Action was presently taken, nevertheless, that fettered the bishops in Erastian bonds, against which they struggled in vain during the establishment of Episcopacy.

On the 10th November, Parliament, with Lauderdale as royal commissioner, passed the notorious Assertory Act, which enacted that "his majesty hath the supreme authority and supremacy over all persons and in all causes within this kingdom; and that by virtue thereof, the ordering and disposal of the external government and polity of the Church doth properly belong to his majesty and his successors, as an inherent right of the crown; and that his majesty and successors may settle, enact, and emit such constitutions, acts, and orders concerning the administration of the external government of the Church, and the persons employed in the same, and concerning

¹ For the poor opinion of the Scottish bishops entertained by archbishop Burnet, see his letter to Dr. Sancroft, archbishop of Canterbury, written in 1684. Grub. iii. 276.

Gilbert Burnet had no higher opinion of them, with the exception of Leighton and Scougal. See *History of His Own Time*, i. 373.

all ecclesiastical meetings and matters to be proposed and determined therein, as they in their royal wisdom shall think fit." This was Erastianism naked and not ashamed. The Crown was not only to determine the polity of the Church, but "all ecclesiastical matters," not excluding the subject matter of its faith. Some of the bishops, aware of the character of the Act, absented themselves from the Parliament. Archbishop Burnet, who would have had something unpleasant for Lauderdale's ears, had been deprived of his seat. The primate spoke against it, not very courageously, and voted for it, as also did Leighton, though reluctantly it may be believed. Lauderdale made no secret that his object was to humble the bishops and make the mitre subservient to the crown. It was also whispered that he was aware the duke of York was a Romanist, and that the Act could be conveniently worked for the establishment of popery on his succession to the throne.¹

The first application of the Assertory Act was in the expulsion of archbishop Burnet. The see of Glasgow was by royal letter declared vacant. Burnet had the option of resignation, which he preferred to courting the king's further displeasure ; and accordingly he resigned in January 1670. In resisting the tyranny of the Crown and its agents, so far as he did, he exhibited a commendable courage. One thing he lacked—an equally commendable charity, as shown by the inconsiderate action of himself and his synod against the Indulgence offered to the deprived ministers. It was not a time for the bishops to stand stiffly on the dignity of their office, but by prudent administration and fatherly kindness to conciliate the disaffected. Acting in this spirit the office

¹ *Acts Parl. Scot.* vii. 554 ; *Wodrow*, ii. 136-139 ; *Burnet*, i. 492-495.

would have taken care of itself, and even had the policy failed, the bishops would have exonerated themselves from blame, and by their charity have covered a multitude of sins.¹

¹ Burnet, i. 497 ; Wodrow, ii. 144 ; Mackenzie, pp. 158, 159.

CHAPTER XVII

CHARLES II.—FROM 1670 TO THE MURDER OF ARCH-BISHOP SHARP IN 1679

Leighton Commendator of Glasgow—His policy approved by the king—Holds diocesan synod in Glasgow—Visits the diocese—Confers with clergy in Edinburgh—His proposals—Appoints itinerant preachers, "the bishop's evangelists," in the west—Conferences at Paisley and Edinburgh—Causes of Leighton's failure—Act against field conventicles—Other penal Acts—Another Indulgence, 1672—Leighton archbishop of Glasgow, 1672—Dean Ramsay of Glasgow bishop of Dunblane—Leighton's resignation refused by king—Resigns next year and retires to Sussex—His death in 1684—Archbishop Burnet restored to Glasgow, 1674—Gilbert Burnet resigns professorship—Bishops agitate for national synod—Sharp opposes and rebukes bishop Ramsay—Covenanters' meetings—Their hatred of Sharp—Fresh persecutions—Lauderdale's "Highland Host" in the west—Mitchell's trial and execution for attempt on Sharp's life—Murder of the archbishop—His character and career.

LEIGHTON was offered the see of Glasgow, but with the same modesty that made him at first decline Dunblane he now refused the archbishopric. In the hope, however, that the Government would support his scheme for conciliating the nonconforming ministers he consented to act as commendator of Glasgow while retaining the supervision of Dunblane.¹ He was invited to the Court to explain his proposals, and on the way south met Gilbert Burnet, still professor of divinity in Glasgow. The two men were

¹ See interesting series of letters *and Queries* for February and March from Leighton to Lauderdale in *Notes* 1862.

warmly attached to each other, widely different as they were; the bishop shy in manner and ascetic in habits, the professor always fussy and sometimes officious. Both men had the peace of the Church at heart, and Leighton's policy of comprehension had Burnet's warmest support. The king also approved of it, and instructed Lauderdale to have it passed into law.

In August 1670 Leighton held a synod in Glasgow, and counselled the clergy to bear patiently the wrongs and reproaches to which they were subject from the Covenanters, as part of the discipline of the cross.¹ To insure that they were themselves blameless in their ministry he appointed a committee to examine into their life and morals. Some were censured, and some deposed from the ministry. The bishop, with all his gentleness, was a strict disciplinarian, and could make his pastoral staff a rod of correction.

From his synod he passed through the western diocese, visiting indulged ministers and making overtures of peace to the disaffected. Burnet, who accompanied him, says his proposals met with little acceptance, and that the ministers were barely civil to the bishop. On the same errand he attended a conference at Edinburgh between Episcopal and Presbyterian clergymen invited by the Council. Lauderdale and other ministers of State were present, but the primate kept aloof. Leighton spoke first of the antiquity and universality of the office of bishop, and then stated how much he was prepared to abate of its claims in the interests of peace. His proposals were, that the bishops should be recognised as perpetual moderators in the Church courts; that ordinations should take place with the concurrence of the presbyters, not in

¹ Kirkton admits that he has known dissolute men of his own party atone for the sin of the previous night by insulting a curate in the morning.

the cathedrals but in the parish church of the ordinand ;¹ that provincial synods should be held every three years, in which complaints might be lodged against the bishops, and censure pronounced on them for offences proven. With persuasive power he argued these several points, but without convincing the Presbyterian ministers. Hutcheson answered that Leighton's modifications could bind none but himself, and that there was no certainty of their permanence. The earl of Kincardine favoured the scheme, and urged that it should at once become law, but Lauderdale declared it imprudent to make any constitutional change unless they were assured of its practical success.²

In spite of discouragement Leighton persevered. With a view to conciliate the disaffection in the west he appointed six eminent clergymen, of whom Gilbert Burnet was one,³ to traverse the diocese as itinerant preachers, to address the people, and take counsel with the ministers. They were popularly known as "the bishop's evangelists," and although the Covenanters were willing to hear them they showed little disposition to be reconciled even to Leighton's moderate Episcopacy. The peasantry, according to Burnet, possessed a remarkable knowledge of the controverted points, and a readiness to support their views with texts of Scripture, but were, he says, vain and conceited, and given to magnify petty scruples into vital principles. Covenanting preachers followed in the wake of "the evangelists," as the Jews once followed St. Paul, and fortified the people against any dallying with "Prelacy and Erastianism."⁴

¹ The cathedrals in most dioceses were in ruins, and in such cases as St. Andrews, where Sharp officiated in what is now the Town Church, the churches commonly used for ordinations must have been merely pro-cathedrals.

² Burnet, i. 497-505 ; Wodrow,

ii. 175.

³ Lawrence Charteris, appointed professor of Divinity in Edinburgh University in 1675, was another of the six.

⁴ Burnet, i. 507, 508 ; Wodrow, ii. 177.

The fond endeavour was repeated in a conference held at Paisley in December 1670, where Leighton and Burnet, together with Ramsay, dean of Glasgow,¹ and two laymen, met thirty of the "outed" ministers. The bishop expatiated on the merits of primitive episcopacy, and asked the ministers whether they would have resisted it had they lived in the days of the Nicene Council. In answer, they drew a distinction between the episcopacy advocated by the bishop and that which had been established in Scotland by royal prerogative. Burnet replied that the episcopacy they commended was entirely on primitive lines, Scriptural and Apostolic, and that they had no wish to support any other. The ministers asked time for consideration, and the following six propositions were handed to them in writing—(1) That the dissenting brethren by attending presbyteries and synods should not thereby renounce their own convictions as to Church government; (2) that all Church business should be settled in presbyteries and synods by the free votes of the presbyters; (3) that in case of difference in the diocesan synod, an appeal should lie to the provincial synod; (4) that entrants to the ministry should be examined by the presbytery, and ordained by the bishop and presbyters in the parish church; (5) that no entrant should be obliged to make any canonical oath or subscription to the bishop against his own free will; (6) that an overture should be presented to the king's commissioner to give effect to these propositions.

Leighton in his charity went as far in the way of compromise as the principle of episcopacy would let him, and considerably farther than most of his prelatie brethren would have followed him. The weakness of his position lay in his isolation, in the lukewarmness of the other

¹ The first but not the last dean Ramsay in Scottish story.

bishops, and in the indifference, if not hostility, of Lauderdale to any scheme favourable to the peace of the Church. The bishop continued to preach peace, and in January 1671 made one more effort to ensure it. He met the Presbyterian ministers at Edinburgh, and asked them if they were prepared to accept his proposals. They were not prepared, nor were they ready with any proposals of their own. Leighton was sorely disappointed at the apparent hopelessness of his mission. Peace like a phantom eluded his grasp. All that he could do was to exonerate himself from any responsibility for the miserable discords, so distasteful to his own mind. This he did in the following appeal, addressed to the irreconcilable ministers: "My sole object has been to procure peace, and to advance the interests of true religion. In following up this object I have made several proposals, which, I am fully sensible, involved great diminutions of the just rights of episcopacy. Yet, since all Church power is intended for edification, and not for destruction, I thought that in our present circumstances episcopacy might do more for the prosperity of Christ's kingdom, by relaxing some of its just pretensions, than it could by keeping hold of all its rightful authority. It is not from any mistrust of the soundness of our cause that I have offered these abatements; for I am well convinced that episcopacy has subsisted from the apostolic age of the Church. Perhaps I may have wronged my own order in making such large concessions; but the unerring Discerner of hearts will justify my motives, and I hope ere long to stand excused with my own brethren. You have thought fit to reject our overtures, without assigning any reason for the rejection, and without suggesting any healing measures in the room of ours. The continuance of the divisions, through which religion languisheth, must consequently lie at your

door. Before God and man, I wash my hands of whatever evils may result from the rupture of this treaty. I have done my utmost to repair the temple of the Lord, and my sorrow will not be embittered by compunction should a flood of miseries hereafter rush in through the gap you have refused to assist me in closing."¹ Whatever view may be taken of the wisdom of Leighton's policy, there can only be one opinion of his devoted and unwearied charity. Whether he stood excused with his own brethren, as he hoped, or not, he has long been more than excused by posterity which honours him not less for his noble Christian character than for his persevering endeavours for the peace and unity of a distracted Church. The Scottish episcopate of that day had at least one Barnabas in its brotherhood.

While Leighton was still busy with his scheme, Parliament met in the summer of 1670 and passed a severe Act against conventicles. Hitherto these meetings had been generally held in private houses; now the people met openly in fields, and in daily increasing numbers armed for resistance. Three such meetings held this year—at Beithhill near Dunfermline, at Livingseat in Carnwath, and at Torwood in Stirlingshire—attracted the attention of the Government and provoked its insane policy of penal suppression. Ministers were forbidden to preach or pray at any field meeting under the penalty of death and confiscation of their goods; and persons present at conventicles were subjected to ruinous fines. This odious statute was passed so hastily by Parliament that Leighton was unaware of it, and on his remonstrating with lord Tweeddale he was assured that it was passed merely to deter the seditious from treasonable meetings, and was

¹ Burnet, i. 511-514; Wodrow, ii. 180-182; Pearson's *Life of Leighton*, pp. lxxxvii.-xcii.

not intended to be enforced. This proved to be a subterfuge, for sheriffs were ordered to bring offenders to justice, and a reward of five hundred marks was offered for the seizure of every field preacher.¹ Nor did this penal statute stand alone. Two more of a similar character were passed. The one imposed fines and imprisonment for having a child baptized by an "outed" minister; and the other imposed similar punishment for absence without sufficient reason on three consecutive Sundays from the parish church.

History repeats itself. The same penalties inflicted in previous reigns upon Roman priests and people for saying or hearing a mass, were now inflicted upon Presbyterian preachers and people for attending conventicles. Substitute conventicle for mass and the situations are identical. It may also be added that had the Episcopalians assumed an attitude of defiance under the two Covenants, and armed themselves for resistance, there would then have been for certain another experience of such persecutions as disgraced this reign. There was, however, one element peculiar to the persecution of the Presbyterians under Charles II.—the frequent and heavy fines ruthlessly imposed and exacted by the Parliament. In some cases the fine was as much as five thousand marks, and in the shire of Renfrew alone twelve gentlemen were fined to the amount of 368,000 pounds Scots, a sum that would have ruined them had not the government accepted a composition. Lauderdale and his associates grew rich and fattened upon the miseries of their countrymen. The legalised robbery must have been all the more galling to the despoiled Presbyterians, from the fact that their chief persecutor and spoiler was once their chosen representative in the Westminster Assembly.

¹ *Acts of Parl. Scot.* viii. 9, 10; Burnet, i. 505-507.

In June 1672 Parliament again met under Lauderdale, now created a duke, as commissioner. Still another Act was passed which inhibited the "outed" ministers from ordaining men to the ministry, and subjected both ordaining and ordained to fines and banishment. Parents keeping a child unbaptized for more than thirty days were also to be mulcted for the offence, the object being to compel them to bring their children to the parish church for baptism. The Bass Rock was at this time converted into a State prison, and several of the refractory ministers, and others besides, were sent thither to wear out their lives amid the waste of waters and the screaming of sea-gulls. To St. Baldred the Bass had been a chosen hermitage; to the Covenanters it was a loathsome prison.¹

Another Indulgence, the second of its kind, was offered by the Privy Council in September 1672. No rational explanation can be given of the fitful action of the government. Whether owing to divided counsels, or to lucid intervals of sanity, or, as is most probable, to the caprice of the Court in London, the action of the Scottish Council oscillated like a pendulum between maddening severity and sweet reasonableness. The ministers who had hitherto held out against compromise were now offered parishes in the dioceses of Edinburgh, Glasgow, Galloway, and Argyll, where they would be permitted to discharge ministerial duties and allowed a portion of the benefice. Fully eighty ministers accepted the Indulgence, for which they were heartily abused as traitors by the irreconcilable section, who still clung tenaciously to the wildest traditions of the Covenant.²

Leighton, in 1672, accepted the archbishopric of

¹ *Acts of Parl. Scot.* viii. 71, 89; Burnet, i. 586-591.

² Burnet, i. 591; Wodrow, ii. 203-210. Kirkton, the historian, a Pres-

byterian minister, refused this Indulgence and wrote against it. See p. viii. of Sharpe's edition of Kirkton.

Glasgow and resigned Dunblane, where he was succeeded by James Ramsay, dean of Glasgow.¹ Gilbert Burnet had probably a hand in persuading Leighton to come to Glasgow. It is certain that he accepted the more onerous responsibility with a view to promote his favourite object. Like Sempronius he deserved success, but unhappily he could not command it. Conventicles did not decrease in his troubled diocese, nor did the bitter animosity of those who refused the Indulgence. The archbishop was suspected both by his own episcopal brethren and by the nonconformists. Hopeless of his labours for peace, he next year went to London to submit his resignation to the king. It is creditable to Charles that he refused to accept it, and persuaded Leighton to make another year's trial of office. He returned to Glasgow, happy in the prospect of a speedy release, and told Burnet that there was now only one uneasy stage between him and rest.² At the expiry of the year he ceased to be archbishop of Glasgow, and retired to Broadhurst in Sussex, where he spent the evening of his life with a widowed sister, assisting the parish clergy in their duties, and ministering to the sick and poor in their homes.

Leighton had often expressed the singular wish that he might die at an inn, as a traveller on his homeward way. His wish was gratified. In the summer of 1684 the earl of Perth, while in London, told Burnet, who had by that time resigned his Glasgow professorship, that he wished to see Leighton. The good man complied and came to London, taking up his residence at the Bell Inn,

¹ See the high character given to Ramsay by Leighton, *Notes and Queries*, 15th February 1862.

² As a proof of Leighton's despair of reconciling the Covenanters he writes in a letter to Lauderdale of this year (1674), touching the many

vacant kirks in the west—"The truth is we have not men for them, and the people in most of the parishes would not receive angels if they commit the horrid sin of going to presbyteries and synods," *i.e.* under the archbishop. *Notes and Queries*, p. 166, for 1862.

Warwick Lane. Burnet says he still appeared robust in health though in his seventy-fourth year, his dark hair unsilvered, and cheerful as was his wont. When congratulated by his friend on his appearance, he replied that his work and his journey were alike nearly ended. Next day, the 25th June, he was seized with a sudden illness, and died in a few hours. And thus passed away to the rest that remaineth one of the noblest and saintliest of Scottish churchmen.

In September 1674 archbishop Burnet was restored by royal letter to his former see of Glasgow, and was again made a member of the Privy Council. Both archbishops were members of the council, but down to 1678 when Paterson, bishop of Edinburgh, was admitted, no other bishop had a seat in it.¹ This is a fact to be remembered in reckoning the responsibility of the bishops, alike for the persecutions and the indulgences emanating from the Council.

The two Burnets, the archbishop and the professor in Glasgow, were like the proverbial birds in the same bush—not made to live harmoniously together. The professor resigned shortly after the archbishop's restoration, and although his resignation was attributed to a quarrel with Lauderdale, it is probable that had Leighton not resigned, Burnet would have remained. After some stay in London and in Holland, he returned with the Prince of Orange to assume the mitre of the ancient see of Sarum.

During the years 1674 and 1675 the bishops of Edinburgh, Brechin, and Dunblane, and the presbyters of Edinburgh, agitated the Church for a national synod to procure some urgently needed reforms and to settle the quarrel with the Presbyterians. The bondage of the Church to the State was felt by many churchmen to be no

¹ See Fountainhall's *Historical Notices*, i. 203.

longer tolerable. It was easier, however, to kick against the Erastian yoke than to get rid of it. Archbishop Burnet was in partial sympathy with the movement, but the primate, as usual, stood on his dignity, jealous of the episcopal prerogative, and much more of his own primatial authority. Lauderdale was indifferent to the tranquillity of the Church, and resolutely determined that neither bishops nor clergy should have any particle of independence so long as he could help it. Petitions for a national assembly had been prepared in some of the diocesan synods, and Lauderdale on hearing of it wrote to the primate condemning the proceedings, and comparing them to the action of the Covenanters that had led to civil war. In the same unfavourable light he represented the matter to the Court, and Sharp supported him by writing to archbishop Sheldon, requesting his influence with the king against the calling of a national assembly. The primate's temper is said to have been ruffled by attacks that had been made upon his administration by some of the clergy, and chiefly by Andrew Cant of Edinburgh (son of the Presbyterian minister of that name), who had called him a hindrance and grievance to the Church.

The matter, however, was not allowed to rest. The bishops of Edinburgh and Brechin (Young and Laurie) had yielded to the primate's influence and withdrawn from the movement, but Ramsay, the new bishop of Dunblane, still upheld the banner of reform. At a meeting in July 1674, held at St. Andrews, to which the bishops of that province and some of the presbyters were summoned, Ramsay advocated the calling of a national synod.¹ The primate opposed it and roughly rebuked him, whereupon the bishop withdrew from the meeting. Next day he

¹ See, as to the movement for a national synod, letter from Leighton, *Notes and Queries*, 1st March 1862.

wrote a letter to the archbishop vindicating his opinions, and his right to maintain them, repudiating at the same time the proceedings of the previous day, as the meeting was neither a national nor a provincial synod. He warned the primate that the unconstitutional and arbitrary conduct of the bishops would injuriously compromise the Church, and he insisted that the archbishop of Glasgow ought to have been consulted both as a brother metropolitan and in consideration of his wisdom and experience. He added that the faith and worship of the Church deserved consideration as well as its discipline, and that the schisms which distracted them could not be healed by a rough use of secular power, but only by the constitutional action of the Church in a national synod to which the moderate nonconforming ministers should be invited.

The wisdom of bishop Ramsay's advice is very apparent to us, but the primate did not see it, and the action which followed confirms the opinion that with his brother bishops he could be dictatorial and tyrannical. On the 28th July a letter from the king ordered the primate to remove Ramsay to the vacant bishopric of the Isles—a mild form of banishment—and to send Cant, Turner, and Robertson, ministers of Edinburgh, and Hamilton of Leith, to other parishes. Sharp's hand was easily traced in this piece of petty tyranny. The four ministers were removed, and the bishop meanwhile suspended. He pleaded his case before the king in person, and there was an angry correspondence between him and the primate.¹ A court of Scottish bishops was appointed to investigate the charges against Ramsay.

¹ Ramsay referred to Sharp's letters, in which he had threatened to leave the country, were Episcopacy introduced. The primate answered him, "Better men than you and I

have, without any criminous imputation, changed their sentiments about form of governments and public administrations."—Lang's *St. Andrews*, p. 301.

In a document which he presented to the court he advocated not only a national synod, but the compilation of a catechism, liturgy, and canons, seeing that the Church was alike without a form of instruction for the young, of worship for the people, and of discipline for the clergy. The court was held in September, and in April of next year, 1676, Ramsay was restored to Dunblane, and the four presbyters to their parishes.¹

Ramsay and the ministers so far had the victory over their metropolitan, but their triumph failed to further the scheme of a national synod, and to appease the weary strife with the nonconforming preachers and their flocks in the west. Conventicles multiplied, and their frequenters became more defiant. The dangers incident to their meetings were an additional incentive, and increased both the religious fervour and the excitement of the persecuted Covenanters. Kirkton describes their situation at this time in the following sentence: "The discourse up and down Scotland was the quality and success of the last Sabbath's conventicle; who the preachers were; what the number of the people was; what the affections of the people were; what doctrine the minister preached; what change was among the people; how sometimes the soldiers assaulted them, and sometimes killed some of them, sometimes the soldiers were beaten, and some of them killed." It is a graphic picture, but Kirkton's "up and down Scotland," should be read up and down the west of Scotland, the district where the Covenanters predominated.

The dispute with bishop Ramsay and the ministers had shown the primate how he was regarded by some in "his own household," and an incident of June 1674

¹ Cant was made principal of Edinburgh University, 29th September 1675. Dalziel's *Hist. Univ.*

ii. 205; Wodrow, ii. 300-314; *Life of Robert Blair*, pp. 541-549; Burnet's *Own Time*, ii. 46, 47.

Opened his eyes to the feelings with which he was regarded by those who were without. A deputation of Covenanting ladies, headed by the widow of the minister Livingstone, approached the privy councillors in the Parliament House, seeking the relief of their ministers from oppression. The earl of Rothes, now chancellor, enjoyed a scene that was novel in that quarter, and jested freely with the ladies. When archbishop Sharp appeared their ire broke out in opprobrious epithets: "Judas," and "traitor," they exclaimed, and one of them, laying her hand on his neck, said that it should yet pay for all. Their petition was rejected, and some of the subscribers were afterwards imprisoned, and others banished from Edinburgh.¹

Another fit of severity seized the Council, and again the spirit of persecution raged. Many of the ministers and laymen who had been summoned by the Council for complicity with conventicles failed to appear, and in 1675 letters of "intercommuning," a species of civil excommunication, were issued against a hundred defaulters in the west. Sheriffs and their officers were sent in search of them, and people harbouring or helping them were made guilty of their crime. Under this reign of terror, many fled to the hills, where they nursed resentment, and vowed revenge against an intolerant government. Bonds were also forced upon the people for signature, making them responsible for the conduct of dependents. Magistrates were made responsible for conventicles held in burghs, heritors for meetings on their grounds, and heads of households were made answerable for family and servants attending the parish church.

The better to put down opposition, Lauderdale, in 1677, let loose upon the west country about ten thousand

¹ Wodrow, ii. 268, 269; Kirkton, pp. 343-346; Mackenzie, p. 273.

soldiers, of whom six thousand were Highland clansmen. They were quartered on the inhabitants, who had to support them, and for three months they pillaged the people at their pleasure. Wodrow relates that "when the Highlanders went back, one would have thought they had been at the sacking of some besieged city, by their baggage and luggage." Beyond rapacious plundering "the Highland Host" inflicted no other injury on the Lowlanders, the only life lost in the campaign being that of a Highlander killed at Campsie, and their conduct so far contrasts favourably with that of the Covenanting soldiers who had carried fire and sword into Cantyre and the Isles during the previous reign.¹

Reference has been made to the attempt of James Mitchell to murder archbishop Sharp in 1668. The features of the assassin had imprinted themselves so vividly on the primate's imagination that he never forgot them. Six years afterwards, at the funeral of Robert Douglas, he recognised Mitchell, and had him brought before the Privy Council. As there was no evidence against him but the archbishop's he was invited to make a confession on the promise of his life being spared. Thereupon he pleaded guilty to having fired the shot at the archbishop. The Council remitted him to the court of Justiciary for sentence, and there he denied the written confession which he had formerly signed. Though cruelly tortured, he refused to make any admission to the court, whereupon he was sent back to the Tolbooth, and from that to the Bass Rock. In 1677 he was again brought up for trial, and tortured by "the boot" until insensibility relieved him. When his advocate, Sir George Lockhart, pleaded the promise of his life made by the Council, Rothes the chancellor, Hatton the treasurer, Lauderdale,

¹ Wodrow, ii. 412-432; Burnet, ii. 133-136; Kirkton, pp. 385-391.

and the archbishop, all swore that no such assurance had been given. Lockhart cited a copy of the Act of Council in which mention of the promise was made, and requested that the original should be produced. Lauderdale refused it indignantly, declaring that he had not come there to be accused of perjury. The jury found Mitchell guilty, and he was hanged at the Grassmarket on the 18th January 1678.¹

Burnet and Fountainhall both mention that after the trial Lauderdale would have reprieved the miserable man, but that Sharp strongly opposed it. The dread of assassination which constantly haunted him is usually pleaded as an excuse for a severity that is said to have been alien to his nature. No such plea can clear the primate and the other three noblemen implicated, all principals of the State, from a strong suspicion of perjury.²

The west country, and Fifeshire to a less extent,³ were the disturbed districts, and there persecution and disorder continued. The westland gentry resolutely refused to subscribe Lauderdale's bonds, and he swore by the sacred name that he would compel them. The story of Mitchell's trial spread like wildfire among the disaffected; it made new enemies to the government, and deepened the resentment of those that were already hostile. The primate had the chief share of odium, and no camp meeting would have been reckoned complete in which he was not denounced as a perjured and apostate traitor, the chief persecutor of the saints, and the enemy

¹ See "Debate" on Mitchell's trial, Fountainhall's *Observes* (Bannatyne Club), pp. 281-302.

² *State Trials*, vi. 1228-1270; Wodrow, ii. 248-252, 454-473; Burnet, ii. 125-132, and 299; Foun-

tainhall's *Historical Notices*, i. 182-186.

³ See Burton, vii. 218, who says—"In Fifeshire there was but a small number of the peculiar people."

of God and man. Knox's writings and the Old Testament were searched for precedents, and the acts of Phinehas and Ehud were held up in sermons and pamphlets as fitting examples to be followed.¹ The duke of Hamilton and the earls of Atholl and Perth went to London to remonstrate with the king against the severity of Lauderdale. Charles approved of his commissioner's policy, and in this he was supported by a letter from the Convention of Estates, written this same year, highly commending Lauderdale's administration.

The commentary upon this commendation was the murder of archbishop Sharp in the following year. A body of twelve fanatics, headed by Hackston of Rathillet and Balfour of Kinloch, better known as "Burley,"—the rest were artizans and peasants,—were in search of one Carmichael, sheriff-depute of Fife, who had made himself obnoxious to the Covenanters by the suppression of their conventicles. Missing the sheriff-depute they fell in with the archbishop. He was on his way from Edinburgh to St. Andrews, and had stopped at Ceres to smoke a friendly pipe with the minister. A boy informed Hackston and his party that the primate's carriage had just passed. Pursuit was made on horseback, and the carriage was overtaken at Magus Moor, within three miles of St. Andrews. The archbishop was summoned to

¹ The use of the Old Testament, almost to the exclusion of the New, is a feature in the polemical literature of Scottish Protestants, from John Knox to the Covenanters. Dr. Cunningham had the curiosity to go over the Scripture references in a well-known pamphlet entitled "Issachar's Ass braying under a double burden," date 1622, and he found that 84 of these references are to the Old, and 15 to the New Testament. See *History Ch. Scot.*

ii. 256. Of lord Crawford, an eminent leader of the Covenanters, it is remarked by Macaulay (*Hist. of England*, iii. 28) that "He had a text of the Old Testament ready for every occasion . . . It is a striking characteristic of the man and the school in which he had been trained, that in all the mass of his writing which has come down to us, there is not a word indicating that he had ever heard of the New Testament."

come forth and answer for his misdeeds. They fired into the carriage, and Sharp, wounded by one of the shots, was dragged out into the road, pleading with Hackston to protect him, while his daughter made frantic efforts to save him. The assassins were new to the bloody work, and it took many thrusts and blows to satisfy them that the deed was thoroughly done. It was at noon on the 3rd May 1679 that the archbishop was murdered, in the sixty-first year of his age, within sight of the towers of his cathedral city.¹

Although the murder seems to have been the work of a sudden impulse, it is well known that the primate's life had been frequently threatened; and one of the guilty gang afterwards confessed that he had twice sought an opportunity to kill him. Whatever may be thought of Sharp, unprejudiced minds will condemn his assassination as "a foul deed foully done." Wodrow, writing dispassionately many years afterwards—in the reign of George I.—glosses over the murder in the following ingenious fashion: "Upon the whole, though the most part of good people in Scotland could not but observe and adore the holy and righteous providence of God in the removal of this violent persecutor . . . yet they could not approve of the manner of taking him off, nor would they justify the actors." It was a test question afterwards put to the Covenanters by officers of the government, "Was the killing of the arch-

¹ For a fuller account and authorities, see Burton, vii. 207-216; also *Memorials of the Wemyss Family*, ed. by Sir Wm. Fraser, i. 279. The earl of Wemyss, who maintained friendly relations with the archbishop until his death, makes a feeling reference to the cruel murder at Magus, "on 3rd May, commonly called the Rude Day." He adds that "the chief actors were

John Balfour of Kinloch and Ro. Hackston of Raffillite, his brother-in-law, and nine or ten more base mechanic fellows," and that he was "most honourably buried as Lord Primate on 17th May." An elaborate monument in marble with figures in relief, telling the story of the murder, was erected by his son in the Town Church of St. Andrews, where the primate used to officiate.

bishop murder?" Many of them were prepared to suffer rather than admit it.¹

The archbishop, it must be admitted, had stood in a false position from the beginning. He occupied a place which he should have felt barred against him by honour and duty, and he used his official position to shield abuses, to foster Erastianism in the Church, and to encourage the government in the persecution of his former co-religionists. His private life was irreproachable; he was liberal in his charities to the poor, hospitable to his friends, and exemplary in the discharge of his public duties. The stories that were circulated to the contrary were the unscrupulous fabrications of his enemies.

The archiepiscopal see of St. Andrews had proved fatal to many of its occupants. Graham, the first archbishop, was persecuted to insanity and imprisoned for life; Beaton was assassinated in the castle at St. Andrews; Hamilton, his successor, was hanged at Stirling; old titular Adamson was reduced to semi-insanity and beggary before he died; Spottiswoode's life was threatened until he was driven from the country; and now Sharp was murdered on Magus Moor. From Graham's deposition in 1478 until Sharp's assassination in 1679, the history of the primacy of St. Andrews affords melancholy testimony to the troubled ecclesiastical condition of Scotland for two hundred years.²

¹ Wodrow, iii. 41-51; Burnet, ii. 226, 227; Kirkton, pp. 403-424.

² An article in the *Scottish Review* for July 1884, containing some hitherto unpublished letters of archbishop Sharp, shows his conduct in a very unfavourable light. There are also several letters which passed between the archbishop and the earl of Wemyss, published for the first time in Sir Wm. Fraser's *Memorials of the Family of Wemyss*, iii. 129-141. The letters, dating from 1664 to 1678, show the friendly relations

subsisting between them, and the high regard entertained by the earl for the primate. See *True and Impartial Account* of Sharp, published anonymously in 1723; *The Lauderdale Papers* (Camden Society), 1884-85 edited by Mr. Osmund Airy. See also an account of Sharp in *Notes and Queries* for 26th October 1867, signed A. S. A., and article in *N. British Review*, June 1867, on correspondence between Sharp and P. Drummond.

CHAPTER XVIII

CHARLES II.—FROM 1679 TO THE KING'S DEATH IN
1685

The Covenanters at Rutherglen—Graham of Claverhouse—Skirmish at Drumclog—Insurrection of Covenanters—Battle of Bothwell Brig—Fate of prisoners—Archbishop Burnet primate, and Ross archbishop of Glasgow—Indemnity Act, the third Indulgence—Queensferry and Sanquhar Declarations—Cameron and Cargill leading Covenanters—Fight at Airds Moss—Execution of two women in Edinburgh—John Gibb and his sect—Duke of York's visit and "no popery" riot—Test and Succession Acts—Argyll condemned—Escapes to Holland—Episcopalians oppose Test Act—Quakers persecuted—Parson Gordon of Banchory as a reformer—Death of bishop Scougal—William Carstares and others involved in Rye-house plot—His torture in Edinburgh—Severer measures against Covenanters—Renwick defies the Government—Deaths of leading ecclesiastics and statesmen—Death of the king.

THE murderers of the primate met in a house near Magus Moor and thanked God for the opportunity of ridding the country of its arch-enemy. Upon a reward being offered by the Privy Council for their apprehension, they fled to their sympathisers in the west country. The moderate Covenanters condemned the assassination as a crime and a blunder; the extreme section gloried in it as a deadly blow at prelacy, and followed it up by open rebellion. An armed band of eighty horsemen entered Rutherglen on the 29th May, when the bonfires were blazing for the king's restoration. They extinguished the burghers' fires and kindled a fire of their own in which

they burned all the Acts of Parliament obnoxious to them, affixing on the market cross "The Declaration and Testimony of the true Presbyterian party in Scotland."¹

John Graham of Claverhouse, who had in the previous year been appointed captain of a troop of horse, went westward in search of the insurgents. He came upon them at Drumclog in Strathaven on Sunday the 1st of June, and the encounter, he admits, was "very little to his advantage." He made his escape on a wounded horse, leaving thirty-six of his troopers dead, while the Covenanters lost but three of their number. Hamilton, the commander of the Covenanters, put to death with his own hands one of the prisoners, and was furious that five others were allowed to escape, contrary to his orders that no quarter should be given to "Babel's brats."²

In his report of the skirmish Claverhouse added—"This may be counted the beginning of the rebellion, in my opinion." Like a fiery cross the news of Drumclog spread through all the west country. The Covenanters imagined that the hour of their deliverance had come, and flocked to join the blue banner. The Privy Council in alarm communicated its fears to Whitehall, and the duke of Monmouth was immediately sent north with an army sufficiently strong to make resistance hopeless. Elated with success, the Covenanters had marched upon Glasgow, but the magistrates barricaded the streets and the military were in arms to receive them. After some skirmishing they retired and encamped on Hamilton moor. Their numbers had now risen to about five thousand, but instead of drilling their recruits and providing them with suitable arms, the leaders fell out about Indulgences, Covenants,

¹ Wodrow, iii. 58, 66, 67.

² *Ibid.* p. 69; Shield's *Faithful Contendings*, p. 201; Napier's

Memorials of Dundee, ii. 222; Burton, *Hist. Scot.* vii. 223-226.

and Erastianism. In the midst of their contentions Monmouth attacked them at Bothwell Brig on Sunday 22nd June. There was little fighting except on the narrow bridge with its iron gate in the centre, which Hackston and three hundred men defended stubbornly for some hours. The brief battle, but for Monmouth's clemency, would have ended in a massacre. The Covenanters, anticipating victory and prisoners of war, had erected a gigantic gibbet and piled around it several cart-loads of ropes. Their banner also bore the significant words, "No quarter for the active enemies of the Covenant." The flag, and the gallows, and the ropes are all evidence, confirmed from other quarters, that the Covenanters, given the opportunity, would have been as relentless in persecution as the government.¹

About four hundred fell in the fight and the rout, and twelve hundred were made prisoners and taken to Edinburgh. Of these, two ministers, King and Kid, who were ringleaders, were immediately executed at the Grass-market. Five of the prisoners were taken to Magus Moor, where they were hanged in silly revenge for the archbishop's murder, of which they were innocent. The other prisoners, too many to be accommodated in jails, were penned together for some months in the Greyfriars' churchyard—the same place by a strange irony of fate where the National Covenant had been signed in 1638. Most of them were liberated upon signing bonds not to appear again in arms against the king. About two hundred and fifty, refusing to make any terms with an uncovenanted government, were shipped for Barbadoes—which, however, they never reached. The vessel was wrecked on

¹ "The Covenanters are popularly supposed to have been martyrs for freedom of conscience. The very reverse is the fact; or rather, they were

martyrs for a conscience which urged them to persecute the consciences of others."—Andrew Lang's *St. Andrews*, p. 286.

one of the Orkney islands, and nearly two hundred of the unhappy prisoners were drowned. The remnant saved were glad to make terms and regain their liberty.¹

Dr. Burnet, archbishop of Glasgow, succeeded Sharp in the primacy, and Arthur Ross, bishop of Galloway, was promoted to Glasgow. Burnet, with all his faults, was an able prelate, and but for the Erastianism of the age would have done good service to the Church. Ross was without any of the abilities requisite for the responsible offices into which he was thrust, now in Glasgow, and later in St. Andrews. It was no light misfortune for the Episcopal Church that so weak a man was primate in the crisis of the Revolution.

Shortly after the battle at Bothwell another Indemnity Act was passed with a view to reconcile the nonconforming ministers. It allowed them to preach and administer the sacraments in private houses, provided they did not resort to field conventicles. This was the third Indulgence of the same kind during the reign of Charles II.; the first having been granted in 1669, and the second in 1672. In the language of the Covenanters they were known as "blinks" between the "killing times." Some few took advantage of this "blink," but it only provoked the followers of Richard Cameron and Donald Cargill to more violent measures both against the government and against their more compliant brethren. The "Cameronians," as they were now called from their leader, regarded themselves as the sole depositaries of a valid ministry, and excommunicated the other Presbyterians, as the Protesters had excommunicated the Resolutioners.

Very soon they gave proof of their principles. On

¹ For the rising at Bothwell, see Wodrow, iii. 65-111; Burnet, iii. 227-231; Law's *Memorials*, pp. 149-151; Ure's *Narrative of the Rising*, pp. 455-

483; Russell's *Account of Sharp's murder*, pp. 434-469; Burton, *Hist. Scot.* vii. 226-234.

the 3rd June 1680, Cargill and Hall of Haughhead were at Queensferry. The governor of Blackness attempted to apprehend them, and in the scuffle Cargill escaped and Hall was killed. On his person was found what came to be called the Queensferry Declaration, in which monarchy was repudiated as leading to tyranny, and the king rejected for having himself rejected God.¹ Open proclamation of the same revolutionary principles was made in the town of Sanquhar on the 22nd June. A party of twenty-one armed men, headed by Cameron and Cargill, rode into Sanquhar with drawn swords, and nailed to the market cross "The Declaration and Testimony of the True Presbyterian, Anti-Prelatic, Anti-Erastian, and Persecuted Party in Scotland." In this manifesto they said, "We disown Charles Stewart that has been reigning, or rather tyrannising on the throne of Britain these years bygone. . . . We being under the standard of our Lord Jesus Christ, Captain of Salvation, do declare a war with such tyrant and usurper, and all the men of his practices as enemies of Christ and His cause and covenants."²

The government answered the challenge of the rebels by offering a reward of five thousand merks for the persons of Cameron and Cargill, dead or alive. They had taken refuge among the Society people, the Hill men, the Wanderers, the Faithful Remnant, the Wild Whigs, as they were variously called; and the peasantry of the west would sooner have parted with their lives than have betrayed them. About seventy of the Cameronians, horse and

¹ Wodrow, iii. 207, where the Declaration is given.

² *Ibid.* pp. 212, 213. Law's *Memorials*, pp. 152, 199. Law was a contemporary Presbyterian minister, and censures the wild opinions of the Cameronians. See also *Memorials of Sir John Clerk of Penicuik* (Scot. Hist. Society), pp. 54, 243, 244.

Sir John, who was a "ruling elder" in the kirk says, "All the Cameronians were a wild, vain, and conceited sett of men. Instead of minding their business as Farmers or Manufacturers they amused themselves chiefly with their own schismatick and scholastick divinity and Acts of the General Assemblies."

foot, were surprised on the 22nd July at Airds Moss, on the borders of Ayrshire, by a larger body of royalists under Bruce of Earlsall. Cameron was slain, Hackston made prisoner and hanged in Edinburgh.¹ Donald Cargill was now leader of the Society men, and signalised his leadership by a camp meeting at the renowned Torwood, near Stirling, in October 1680, when he solemnly excommunicated by name the king and the duke of York, and the leading members of the government in Scotland. The excommunication ran in this form—"I, being a minister of Jesus Christ, and having authority and power from Him, do in His name and by His Spirit excommunicate, cast out of the true Church, and deliver up to Satan, Charles the Second, king . . . for his idolatry and perjury in breaking and burning the Covenant." In the same manner the duke of York was dealt with, and "several other rotten malignant enemies on whom the Lord hath ratified that sentence very remarkably."² Cargill ran his race till the following June, when he was captured and executed.

More inexcusable was the hanging of two women, Isabel Alison and Marion Harvey at the Grassmarket, Edinburgh, in January of the same year, 1681. Their opinions were no doubt seditious—they had affirmed that it would be as lawful to kill the king as it was to murder the archbishop—but no government can honourably stoop to make war upon women for the misuse of their tongues. The branks, and not the gallows would, in their case, have been ample correction for their "unruly member." Their execution added one more blot to an escutcheon already shamefully soiled.³

¹ Wodrow, iii. 230-232.

³ Wodrow, iii. 274-287; Grub,

² *Ibid.* pp. 229, 230; Shield's iii. 262.
Hind Let Loose, p. 139.

The fanaticism of the Cameronians took a singular and yet it may be not unnatural form in the opinions of John Gibb, a shipmaster in Bo'ness. He had been an ardent "professor" among the Society men, and afterwards formed a little society of his own, composed chiefly of women, known as the "sweet singers." The sect disowned all worldly avocations, deserted their families, and took to camp meetings. There was no "liberty of prophesying" under Charles II., and so the leaders were apprehended in April 1681. They sent from prison a declaration of their principles which showed a curious medley of fanaticism and folly. The metrical psalms they tore from the Bible and burned, as being no part of the Scriptures; for the same reason they condemned chapters and verses, and the headings of chapters, also the translation of both Testaments; they condemned the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, the Confession of Faith, the Acts of the General Assembly, and the Covenants; further, they condemned the use of names for months and days, all holy days except the Sabbath, and all social customs and fashions of the world; and, finally, they condemned Charles Stuart and all other tyrants. Charles Stuart they had to accept before their liberation; their other "condemnations" were allowed to pass.¹

The duke of York paid his first visit to Scotland in 1680, bringing with him his amiable wife, Mary of Este, and his daughter the princess Anne. He conducted himself, as Burnet reports, "in so obliging a manner that the nobility and gentry who had been so long trodden upon by the duke of Lauderdale found a very sensible change, for he gained much on them all." Holyrood was festive and gay, but the populace and the students would

¹ Wodrow, iii. 348-356; *Law's Memorials*, pp. 186-192; Grub, iii. 263.

not forego the pleasant pastime of burning the pope in effigy during the Christmas pageantry. The provost's attempt to interfere led to a riot and the burning of his house. "Turbulent Edinburgh" was still as hostile to popery as it had now become to the Covenants.

Next year the duke returned as royal commissioner of the Parliament which met 28th July 1681, and passed the famous Test and Succession Acts. The Test Act required all who held any kind of public office, civil or ecclesiastical, to swear that they owned the Protestant faith as expressed in the first Confession of 1560, and the king as supreme in all causes temporal and spiritual; that it was unlawful in subjects to take up arms against the king or to enter into covenants and leagues; and that no obligation lay upon them from the National Covenant, or the Solemn League. The Act also provided that the king's brother and sons should be exempted from taking the oath, a provision meant to protect the duke of York, who had become a papist. It was opposed by several members of Parliament, and the earl of Argyll would only take the oath on the understanding that he did so as far as the Test was consistent with itself and with the Protestant religion, and that he was not thereby precluded from seeking reforms in Church and State in a lawful way. The earl had been a staunch supporter of Lauderdale's administration, but he was strongly opposed to popery and to the duke of York. He was impeached and condemned for refusing the Test. The king stayed the proceedings for the time, but the earl, fearing the worst from the tyranny of the Court of Justiciary, made his escape from Edinburgh castle in disguise, and fled to Holland. The Court pronounced sentence of death against him in absence, and under this uncanceled sentence he was afterwards executed. The condemnation of Argyll was much more the con-

demnation of the court which condemned him. "I know nothing of Scotch law," Halifax said to king Charles, "but this I know, that we should not hang a dog here on the grounds on which my lord Argyll has been sentenced."¹

The Episcopal clergy were equally opposed to the Test Act on the grounds that they could not accept the Confession of 1560 in its entirety, nor the royal supremacy in things ecclesiastical as claimed by the Act. Bishop Scougal, too infirm to attend Parliament, became prominent in his opposition to the Test, and diocesan synods spoke out to the same effect. Bishop Paterson of Edinburgh suggested an explanation, which was finally accepted, that they did not swear to every article in the Confession, but only so far as it was consistent with the Word of God and opposed to popery and fanaticism, and that they did not admit under the Test any encroachment on the spiritual powers of the Church. This was converted into an Act of Council and received royal sanction. It did not, however, satisfy every clerical conscience, and about eighty ministers resigned their charges in consequence of the Test Act. Burnet says that several of them went to England and obtained benefices through his influence.²

The Quakers now added to the troubles of the time in Aberdeen.³ They are mostly identified with certain districts in the north of England, where they still hold a hereditary influence. Aberdeen and Mearns were their headquarters in Scotland. Barclay of Ury, their leader, addressed in 1675 his "Apology" for the Quakers to Charles II., from Ury in the Mearns, "the place of my pilgrimage," as he quaintly describes his pleasant abode. Barclay appeals

¹ Macaulay, *Hist. Eng.* chap. v.

² *Acts of Scot. Par.* viii. 243, 244; Wodrow, iii. 309, 312-339; *Law's Memorials*, pp. 203-213; Burnet, ii. 301, 314; *State Trials*,

viii. 843 *seq.*

³ The Registers of the Privy Council for 1665 and 1666 show that the Quakers had already suffered much.

pathetically to the king, as having himself known adversity, to save "the people called Quakers," his innocent subjects, from the tyranny of their enemies. The nonconforming ministers, though sufficiently alive to the injustice of the persecuting laws against themselves, saw no injustice in the persecution of others. They railed on the Council for not enforcing the statutes against Papists and Quakers. Bishop Scougal was also blamed for not prosecuting the harmless Quakers, and the populace of Aberdeen was equally hostile to them. Often imprisoned, they patiently suffered in accordance with their principles of non-resistance. Had they retaliated with the fierceness of the Covenanters, the north-east of Scotland would have added men of another school to the roll of martyrs for conscience' sake.¹

Bishop Scougal's peace was also disturbed by the reforming zeal of one of his clergy, James Gordon of Banchory-Devenick. In 1679 he published anonymously *The Reformed Bishop*, a work in which he satirised the chief prelatie offenders, notably primate Sharp and bishop Paterson of Edinburgh, both of them being culpably involved in the tyrannical measures of this reign. He censured also the mistaken policy of converting Presbyterian moderators into Presbyterian bishops, men out of sympathy with the teaching and traditions of the Church. He advocated the free election of bishops and a gradual restoration of liturgic worship by ecclesiastical authority. Upon the authorship becoming known, Gordon was summoned before the bishops, who justified his worst criticism of their order by reviling him in the most opprobrious terms and depriving him of his benefice. He accepted the sentence without demur, and when the bishops had had time for repentance he again became parson of Banchory-Devenick.²

¹ Chambers's *Dom. Annals of Scot.* ii. 343, 344; Grub, iii. 268, 269.

² Wodrow, iii. 240, and Grub, iii. 272-274 and note.

Bishop Scougal died in February 1682, at the age of seventy-five, and a monument over his grave in the cathedral of Aberdeen still recalls the memory of one of the best bishops of that period.¹ The bishop was predeceased by his distinguished son, Henry, professor of divinity in King's college, and the author of *The Life of God in the Soul of Man*, by which he is best remembered.

Affairs in Scotland continued their troubled course without any change until the discovery of the Rye-house Plot in 1683. The plot was English in origin, but several Scotsmen were implicated in it. Its object was to assassinate the king and his brother, and overturn the government. Lord William Russell and Algernon Sidney were sent to the scaffold, and Baillie of Jerviswood met a like fate in Scotland. Monmouth and Argyll, the latter still in Holland, were also involved in it. Argyll's secretary, Spence, was seized and sent down to Edinburgh, where by torture it was endeavoured to extract the secrets of the plot. In a deciphered letter there was found the name of William Carstares, afterwards principal of Edinburgh University. He also was put to torture, the thumbkins being screwed and tightened till he screamed in agony. Little matter of moment was ascertained by this form of confessional, and Carstares was allowed to retire to Holland. He returned in the retinue of the Prince of Orange, to become the champion of the Revolution in Scotland, and the statesman of the Presbyterian party.²

The discovery of the plot led to increased severity in Scotland. In May 1684 a proclamation was issued with the names of nearly two thousand persons, described as

¹ Burnet, *History of his Own Time*, i. 373, and Preface to his *Life of Bedell*.

² Burton remarks that "Burnet is the chief authority about the torturing,

and in judging what he says we must remember that he was himself concerned in these affairs." — Burton, *Hist.* vii. 247.

fugitives of law, whom the Council marked for punishment unless they admitted their offence and paid a stipulated fine.¹ The Cameronians, nothing daunted, replied by their *Apologetical Declaration*, posted up in November on market crosses and parish churches throughout Galloway, and the shires of Ayr, Lanark, and Dumfries. In this document, drawn up by young Renwick, while professing to disclaim "that hellish principle of killing all who differ in judgment" from them, they repeat their renunciation of the king, and enumerate certain classes who "shall be reputed by us enemies to God and the covenanted work of reformation, and punished as such according to our power and the degrees of their offences." In this list are included "bloody militia men, malicious troopers, soldiers, and dragoons; likewise such gentlemen and commons as viperous and malicious bishops and curates." Two of the king's soldiers were soon afterwards murdered by the Cameronians, and the lords of Session, in answer to a question put by the Privy Council, gave their opinion that any one refusing to disclaim Renwick's Declaration was guilty of treason. The Council thereupon decreed that all who owned the Declaration, or refused to disown it, should be put to death, whether in arms or not; the penalties to be exacted only by persons bearing a commission from the Council, and in presence of at least two witnesses.² Justified as the government was in repressing open rebellion, there was no justification for a measure such as this, which was bound to lead to the gravest abuse.

While affairs were in this tangled condition the king became suddenly ill and died at Whitehall on the 6th February 1685. The primate Sancroft and bishop Ken earnestly urged the dying monarch to repentance. Macaulay says that Ken's "solemn and pathetic exhorta-

¹ Wodrow, iv. 13.

² *Ibid.* pp. 148-155.

tion awed and melted the bystanders," and Burnet, who had little sympathy with the bishop, declares that "he spoke like a man inspired." Charles remained unmoved. What little religion he had inclined him to other counsellors.¹ Before the end, Father Hudleston, the Benedictine monk who had saved the king's life after the battle of Worcester, was brought into the palace by the back stairs, administered extreme unction, and gave the king the viaticum.² The easy good nature and affable manners of Charles made him popular with the English people. His frivolous and dissolute life appears in a less favourable light to posterity. He never revisited Scotland after the Restoration, and his early experiences as a puppet king in the hands of the Covenanters doubtless helped to inspire his repressive policy towards them.

Other leading men had predeceased the king. The duke of Rothes died in 1681, and Lauderdale in the following year. Sir George Gordon of Haddo, who was created earl of Aberdeen, became chancellor, and after two years was succeeded by the earl of Perth. Archbishop Burnet died in 1684, and Wodrow so far relaxes as to pay him the compliment that "he was certainly one of the best morals among the present clergy," in spite of his being, as he adds, "a mighty bigot for the English ceremonies and forms, and as forward to have all the usages of that Church introduced into Scotland as if he had been educated by bishop Laud." The primate was succeeded by archbishop Ross, translated from Glasgow, and Dr. Cairncross, bishop of Brechin, was removed to the western archbishopric.

¹ In January 1669 the king had privately professed his adherence to the Roman Church.—Makower, *Constitutional Hist. Ch. England*, Translation, p. 92.

² Macaulay's *Hist. Eng.* chap. iv.; Bellesheim, iv. 353-356, where Hudleston's full report is given; Plumptre's *Life of Bishop Ken*, i. 183-190.

CHAPTER XIX

REIGN OF JAMES VII., 1685-1689

New Act of Indemnity—Claverhouse in the West—Shooting of John Brown—The Wigton Martyrs—Parliament renews Test Act and penalties against Conventicles—Execution of Argyll—Covenanters in Dunnottar Castle—King favours Romanists—Sets up Roman Catholic worship in Holyrood—Deprivation of bishops for opposing king—Enlarged Indulgence—Capture and execution of Renwick, the last martyr for the Covenants—Retrospect of the persecutions—Imprisonment of seven English bishops—The king's flight and the arrival of William of Orange—Bishop Rose of Edinburgh in London—His interview with English bishops and with prince William—His rejection of William's advances—Rabbling of Episcopal clergy in the west—William and Mary accepted as sovereigns by English Convention and by Scottish—Revolution Settlement—Episcopacy abolished—Battle of Killiecrankie and death of Claverhouse, viscount Dundee—Presbyterianism established—New patronage Act—The Scottish bishops responsible for the disestablishment of Episcopal Church.

JAMES, duke of York, succeeded his brother as James VII. of Scotland. The late king, so far as he had any religion, was a disguised papist; James was an avowed one. His accession, accordingly, did not inspire the country with any hopes of a more tolerant policy. He began, however, in Scotland by holding out the olive branch in the shape of a fresh Act of Indemnity. It was coupled with an oath of allegiance to him as sovereign, and for that reason very few of the western rebels would accept it.

It was at this period that Graham of Claverhouse

earned an unenviable fame. Acting under the new orders of Council he apprehended a small farmer, John Brown of Priesthill, known in Covenanting literature as "the Christian carrier." What happened is told in Claverhouse's report, dated 3rd May 1685, to the duke of Queensberry, the lord treasurer. "On Friday last, among the hills betwixt Douglas and the Ploughlands, we pursued two fellows a great way through the mosses, and in end seized them. They had no arms about them, and denied they had any. Being asked if they would take the *abjuration*, the eldest of the two, called John Brown, refused it; nor would he swear not to rise in arms against the king, but said he knew no king. Upon which, and there being found bullets and match in his house, and treasonable papers, I caused shoot him dead, which he suffered very unconcernedly." The younger man was Brown's nephew, and upon being questioned by Claverhouse he gave information of his uncle having been in arms at Bothwell and of subsequently consorting with rebels. The summary shooting of John Brown will probably be defended by few, but the responsibility for the act lies less with Claverhouse, who was a soldier executing the orders of his superiors, than with the Privy Council who issued the orders.¹

Another case equally notorious and more controverted is that of the two women, Margaret Lauchlison or M'Lauchlan and Margaret Wilson, said to have been drowned at Wigton in this year. The controversy has arisen from the fact that while both women were undoubtedly sentenced to be drowned at Wigton, they were afterwards reprieved by the Council in Edinburgh. There is in the minute of the Council a record of the reprieve, dated 30th April, with an instruction "to interpose

¹ See Napier's *Memorials of Dundee*, i. 141 and ii. 67-79, and Aytoun's note to *Lays of the Scottish Cavaliers*.

with his most sacred majesty for a royal remission of them." Wodrow asserts that, notwithstanding this respite, the women were drowned in the Blednock water, so that "the people of Wigton are deeply guilty, and had no powers for what they did, and the death of these persons was what the Council should have prosecuted them for."¹ It is difficult to believe that with a knowledge of the Council's interposition, the Wigton authorities would have executed their sentence pending the result of the application to the king for its remission. The statement of Sir George Mackenzie, the lord advocate for the time, that only two women, referring to Alison and Harvey, suffered death in these reigns² lends some support to this view. On the other hand, the evidence collected by Dr. Stewart of Glasserton in his *History Vindicated*, makes it still more difficult to escape the conclusion that the women were drowned in spite of the reprieve.³

Another woman, Christian Fyfe, had been condemned to death by the Justiciary Court, 27th March 1682, for having assaulted the clergyman in the Old Kirk, Edinburgh. On her trial she disowned the king and the judges, and declared that it was good service to slay the bishops, that she had gone to the church not to hear the minister but to beat him, because she believed him to be a very Judas and a devil. Wodrow records the sentence against her,⁴ but is silent as to her reprieve, which is vouched by Fountainhall.⁵ If it were worthy of history to set off

¹ *Hist.* iv. 249.

² *Vindication of the Government*, ii. 348.

³ References to the "Wigton Martyrs" are Wodrow, see above, who is followed by Macaulay and others without any sifting; Napier's *Memorials of Dundee*, iii. 686-701, and his pamphlet *Case for the Crown*; Article in *Edinburgh Review* on Napier, July 1863; Dr. Stewart's *History Vindicated*

in the case of the Wigton Martyrs, second edition; Burton, *Hist. Scot.* vii. 253-256; Pamphlet by Joseph Irving, Dumbarton, 1862, suggested by Napier's *Memoirs of Dundee*; *Macmillan's Magazine*, August 1860, December 1862, and December 1863.

⁴ *Hist.* iii. 410.

⁵ *Historical Notices*, p. 168, 27th March 1682.

the folly and cruelty of one side against the cruelty and folly of the other, reference might again be made to the number of "witches," burned or drowned under Presbytery, and outnumbering by twenty to one the martyred women of the Covenant, supposing all the five to have suffered.¹

The first Parliament under James met in April 1685. The royal letter declared his majesty's resolve to protect the religion as established by law, and to punish murderers and assassins who neither feared God nor honoured the king. The Test Act was renewed, as were also the penalties of death and confiscation upon all who attended field conventicles.² The king urged the Scots Parliament to legislate in an opposite direction in favour of his Roman Catholic subjects. The lords of the Articles with difficulty passed a Bill, but the Parliament would have none of it.³ James though beaten was not to be baulked in his design.

The insurrection of the earl of Argyll disturbed the Parliament in its session. He found little support among his clansmen, and still less in the Lowlands, where he expected the Presbyterians to rise in a body against the government. His share in the Lauderdale administration had not been forgotten. While many were in sympathy with the cause they mistrusted the man, and his adventure ended in a miserable fiasco. Apprehended in the Cart water, Renfrewshire, while making his escape in disguise, he was executed in Edinburgh on the old sentence.

The collapse of the insurrection threw more prisoners into the hands of the government. To relieve the jails of Edinburgh and Leith, already overcrowded, a body of a

¹ See references cited for the year 1643. Lyon, in *Hist. of St. Andrews*, ii. 57, note, estimates the number of "witches" who perished at St. An-

draws alone as not less than twenty.

² *Acts of Parl. Scot.* viii. 461.

³ *Ibid.* p. 580.

hundred and thirty-four men and fifty women were sent to Dunnottar Castle on the 18th of May. The Test was offered them at Burntisland, and thirty-nine accepting it were liberated. The rest were marched northwards to their dreary captivity. Little liked as the Covenanters were over Scotland outside their own district, their sufferings in the gloomy old fortress overhanging the North Sea, where they were promiscuously huddled together, so excited public indignation that the government for very shame had to remove them to Edinburgh in the end of July.¹ About a hundred of them were shipped for America, but fever broke out during the long voyage, and less than half of their number landed in New Jersey.²

When Parliament met again, 29th April 1686, the king renewed his endeavours to exempt his own co-religionists from penalties. The earl of Moray, commissioner, and the earl of Perth, chancellor, who had both become papists, introduced a Bill, but fearing defeat withdrew it. James, however, failing with legal methods, had recourse to "sufficient authority" in a shape with which we are familiar—the royal prerogative. In September the Council was instructed by the king to convert the Bill into an Act of Council, and to fit up the abbey church of Holyrood for Roman Catholic worship. The Jesuits accordingly took possession of the church, established a school, and set up a printing press. And so Scotland was at last face to face with the reality of which she had been fighting the shadow for a hundred years

¹ Nine of them died during the two months' imprisonment, and in the churchyard of Dunnottar a tombstone bears their names and the inscription—"Who all died prisoners in Dunnottar Castle, anno 1685, for their adherence to the word of God

and Scotland's Covenanted work of Reformation." It was while examining this monument that Sir Walter Scott met his "Old Mortality."

² Shield's *Hind Let Loose*, p. 201; Wodrow, iv. 325.

and more — namely, the combination of popery and absolutism.¹

Bruce, bishop of Dunkeld, and archbishop Cairncross were deprived for their opposition to the Bill. Paterson, bishop of Edinburgh, got the archbishopric of Glasgow for his pliancy, and bishop Rose, a nephew of the primate, was translated to Edinburgh before he had taken possession of Moray.² The see of Dunkeld was offered to Dr. Drummond, bishop of Brechin, but he declined it on the ground that there was no vacancy. John Hamilton, minister in Edinburgh, was not so scrupulous. He accepted the bishopric, but the chapter opposed his election until the chancellor threatened them with imprisonment for treason. The clergy of sees that were emptied and filled in this despotic fashion were deeply indignant at the king's proceedings.³

A royal proclamation, issued in February 1687, gave permission to Presbyterians, Quakers, and Roman Catholics to meet for worship in private houses, but not in field conventicles. As the Presbyterians showed no liking for this limited liberty, a fuller Indulgence soon followed, suspending all penal laws against nonconformists, and allowing freedom of public worship, provided they did not preach disloyal doctrines. Field preaching was still under ban as fostering sedition, which it undeniably did, if resistance to the government meant sedition. The Privy Council, it should be remembered, struck at camp meetings not as nurseries of religion, but as, to quote its own words, "rendezvouses of rebellion." Many nonconformist ministers now availed themselves of the king's Indulgence,

¹ Wodrow, iv. 358 *seq.*; Burnet, iii. 110; Fountainhall's *Hist. Notices*, ii. 750.

² Rose, who was bishop of Edinburgh at the Revolution, had studied divinity under Gilbert Burnet in Glasgow, and afterwards filled his chair

before he became principal of St. Mary's college, St. Andrews.—Keith's *Catalogue*, p. 155.

³ Fountainhall's *Hist. Notices*, ii. 775 *seq.*; Lyon's *St. Andrews*, ii. 103; Skinner's *Eccles. Hist. Scot.* ii. 502, 503; Keith's *Cat.* pp. 155, 269.

and thanked his majesty in profuse terms for his clemency declaring that they would stand by his sacred person on all occasions.¹

James Renwick still held out against all complicity with royal Indulgences, raising the banner that had fallen from the hands of Cameron and Cargill. The government made many attempts to seize him, and at last he was caught hiding in Edinburgh by some revenue officers in search of smuggled goods. The discovery was as bad a service to the government as to Renwick. On his trial he boldly defended his principles, disowned the king's authority, and would make no concession to save his life. All the inducements offered him by bishops and clergy, and by Dalrymple, the lord advocate, were in vain. The man was, as Burton remarks, "stubborn as fate in courting martyrdom." Martyred he was, on the 17th February 1688—the last, happily, to suffer death for the Covenant.²

The persecution of Cameronians having ceased with the death of Renwick, we may cast a glance backwards on the troubled period of the eight-and-twenty years from 1660 to 1688. Enough has been said in these pages to remove suspicion of any sympathy with the persecuting fanaticism of the government more than with the equal fanaticism of the persecuted, who only wanted opportunity to become the persecutors. The subject is a tempting one to historians, and their treatment of it has commonly manifested a signal want of proportion. The exciting events of the Covenanting struggle in the five western shires, embracing not more than a fifth of the country's area and population, occupy an inordinate space in our

¹ Wodrow, iv. 416-437; Burnet, iii. 171-173; *Miscellany of Maitland Club*, pp. 211, 214.

² Wodrow, iv. 454; Shield's *Life*

of *Renwick*, p. 176. Shield made his escape from the Bass Rock and continued his testimony.

histories, to the neglect of the greater Scotland, which was little affected by "the troubles" in the west country. These events have been painted in the strongest colours on the foreground of the picture, while the larger background has been left in shadow. The natural effect of this treatment is to produce on the reader's mind the impression that nearly the whole of Scotland was Covenanting, and in the same state of chronic rebellion as the turbulent triangle between the Clyde and the Solway. Happy is the nation that has no annals. Such was the enviable state of fourth-fifths of Scotland during the period in which the government was waging unnatural war with a section of its own subjects. Edinburgh may have had little sympathy with the tyranny of the Privy Council that issued its edicts from the capital, but it had certainly as little with the fanaticism which the Council sought to suppress. In other parts of the country the Covenanters were regarded as a strange people, and their sufferings treated with more indifference than they really deserved. What would have been the ultimate result had the king been as strong as he was persistent in persecution is open to conjecture. A strong government would probably in the long run have crushed resistance to its despotic rule; a weak one was doomed to shipwreck in the storm which itself created.

And shipwrecked it was—but not by the action of the Covenanters. The king's seizure and imprisonment in the Tower of the seven English bishops was as fatal to his authority as had been to his father's the attempt to seize the members in the House of Commons. The imprisoned bishops were the representatives of the people of England, determined to make a stand for their ancient national liberties. Their acquittal by the King's Bench, and the cheers of the London populace

on their release, sounded the knell of king James's despotic rule.¹

William of Orange was impatiently watching from beyond the Zuyder Zee the tide of events in our island, ready at the opportune moment to embark his fortunes in an invasion of England. King James, aware of his intention, called out the Scottish militia. They marched into England, but before anything could be done to resist him William had landed at Torbay, 5th November 1688, and the king was soon after a fugitive from his dominions.

The Scottish bishops met at Edinburgh on the 3rd November and sent an address to the king, wishing him "the hearts of his subjects and the necks of his enemies."² In December they deputed bishop Rose of Edinburgh to represent them in London and take counsel with the English bishops.³ By the time the bishop reached London, the Revolution was virtually accomplished. The king had fled, and the prince, his son-in-law, was in possession. A few days after his landing, William issued a Declaration stating that the object of his expedition was to deliver the country from popery and despotism. The Scots Privy Council forbade its circulation, but copies of it were posted in the western burghs, where it was received with acclamation by all but the Cameronians, who condemned it because "no mention was made in it of the covenanted work of Reformation."⁴ In December a mob gathered in Edinburgh, and, assisted by the city trainbands, wrecked the royal chapel in Holyrood and killed

¹ Macaulay, chap. viii. *Hist. Eng.*, gives a graphic description of the trial of the seven bishops.

² This was a little stronger than the address of the Presbyterian ministers thanking James for the Indulgence of 1687.

³ Keith's *Catalogue*, pp. 65, 66. Dr. Bruce, the deprived bishop of Dunkeld, now bishop of Orkney, was to have accompanied bishop Rose, but was prevented by sickness.

⁴ Shield's *Faithful Contendings*, p. 370; Wodrow, iv. 470-472.

several soldiers who defended it. Thieves were among the rioters, and they pillaged papists' houses, while the mob, reinforced by the students, were busy burning the popish emblems.

The papist chancellor, the earl of Perth, was the chief object of popular enmity, and victim of mob violence. He fled from Edinburgh, and was shortly afterwards seized at Kirkcaldy while making his escape from the country in a sailor's dress; was maltreated by the mob, and afterwards confined for more than three years in Stirling castle. On regaining his liberty he followed king James to France.

The west of Scotland, as might have been expected, became the scene of lawless disorder after the king's flight. The withdrawal of the military into England left the Privy Council powerless to preserve order. The Cameronian peasantry armed themselves, formed committees, and perambulated the country on their errand of "rabbling"¹ the parish clergy—the "curates" as they called them. On Christmas Day, 1688—the day deliberately chosen to emphasise the outrage—the rabbling began. During the winter months it continued unchecked, until more than two hundred Episcopal incumbents had been violently ejected from church, manse, and living. Severe must have been the privations and sufferings of the clergy and their families, suddenly turned adrift in the winter season to find where they could the shelter of a home. If no lives were sacrificed, it was more owing to the self-restraint of the clergy than to the humanity of the rabblers.² The reader will, of course, bear in mind that lawless as these proceedings were they were only the natural retaliation for the ejection of the Presbyterian ministers in 1661;

¹ "Rabbling" meant the eviction and maltreatment of the clergy, and generally the wrecking of their houses

by a lawless mob.

² See Lawson, pp. 65-70, for numerous instances of rabbling.

and if his memory is good, it will carry him farther back, to the earlier ejection of the Episcopal clergy—bishops, presbyters, and professors—by the Assembly of 1638. And so the process of ousting went on, whether by legal action or by lawless violence, as each party in turn became dominant.¹

Meanwhile the bishop of Edinburgh was busy in London, but with little success. He called upon Dr. Sancroft, archbishop of Canterbury, and found him as much perplexed about the state of affairs in England as the bishops were in Scotland. He visited Lloyd, bishop of St. Asaph, a personal friend, but from him got little encouragement. When Rose afterwards reported to Sancroft his interview with Lloyd, the primate smiled and said, "St. Asaph was a good man, but an angry man." He next tried Dr. Burnet, who had returned with the prince from Holland, and was known to have influence at Court. Bishop Rose begged him to use it in behalf of the suffering clergy in Scotland, but Burnet assured him that he did not now meddle with Scots affairs. He had interviews also with Turner, bishop of Ely, and Compton, bishop of London. Compton suggested that Rose should address the prince on the subject of the persecutions, and at the same time, for politic reasons, congratulate him on the success of his expedition. This was more than the Jacobite bishop could do, and there was accordingly nothing left for him but to wait patiently the process of events.

The English Convention, after much discussion, declared

¹ In their petition to Parliament the rabbled clergy said that "they were generally reduced to great necessities, and that many of them, with numerous families, were at the point of starving." See Somer's *Tracts Coll.* iii. vol. iv. pp. 133, 141; "An

Account of the present Persecution of the Church in Scotland," "The Case of the Afflicted Clergy of Scotland," published at London in 1690; Burnet's *History*, iii. 344; and his *Vindication*, etc. pp. 148-154; Shield's *Faithful Contendings*, pp. 375, 376.

the throne vacant by the abdication of James, and invited William and Mary to fill it. The Scottish noblemen in London, including Graham of Claverhouse, now Viscount Dundee, thereupon met and agreed to ask William to assume the administration of Scotland, and to summon a Convention of the Estates in Edinburgh for the 14th March ; the which William consented to do.

Bishop Rose now thought it time to return home. A passport was necessary, and the primate advised him to apply to the prince. Dr. Compton agreed to introduce him, and Sir George Mackenzie suggested that the bishop and the Scottish nobles and gentry in London should call upon William in a body and solicit his intervention to stop the rabbling of the western clergy. The prince, when sounded by Compton upon the proposed deputation, objected to meeting any large body, either of Episcopalians or of Presbyterians, for fear of exciting jealousy. "You see, my lord," said Compton, addressing himself to Rose, "that the king having thrown himself upon the water must keep himself swimming with one hand ; the Presbyterians have joined him closely, and offered to support him, and therefore he cannot cast them off unless he could see how otherwise he can be served. And the king bids me tell you that he now knows the state of Scotland much better than he did when he was in Holland ; for, while there, he was made believe that Scotland generally all over was Presbyterian, but now he sees that the great body of the nobility and gentry are for Episcopacy, and it is the trading and inferior sort that are for Presbytery ; wherefore he bids me tell you that if you will undertake to serve him to the purpose that he is served here in England, he will take you by the hand, support the Church and order, and throw off the Presbyterians." Dr. Rose answered that he was not prepared for the change that

had occurred, that he had no instructions to act for the Scottish Church in the crisis, and that, personally, he would sacrifice all rather than renounce his allegiance to James. "In that case," said Compton, "the king must be excused for standing by the Presbyterians."

Next day Compton introduced bishop Rose to the prince at Whitehall. William addressed him, "My lord, are you going to Scotland?" "Yes, sir," said Rose, "if you have any commands for me." The prince replied, "I hope you will be kind to me, and follow the example of England." The bishop was afraid to compromise himself, and answered warily, "Sir, I will serve you so far as law, reason, or conscience shall allow me." The prince understood him, and turned on his heel without further remark. The bishop had gone far to seal the fate of the Episcopal establishment in Scotland.¹

Dr. Scott, dean of Glasgow, who had been rabbled out of the parish church of Hamilton, followed bishop Rose to London with a petition from the archbishop of Glasgow and the western clergy craving protection from persecution. Burnet, notwithstanding his disclaimer of intermeddling in Scots affairs, introduced the dean to the prince. William, though he belied his profession more than once, was in policy, if not on principle, an advocate of toleration, and it is well known that his own idea of ecclesiastical settlement for the three kingdoms was a broad and liberal Episcopacy under which no man would have been persecuted. In answer to the Glasgow petitions he ordered proclamation to be made forbidding all disturbance and violence. The Cameronians showed their respect for it by attacking the congregation in the cathedral

¹ See Keith's *Catalogue*, pp. 65-72, for bishop Rose's account of his London mission. His embarrassment at William's request to be "kind" to

him is quaintly expressed,—“being something diffculted how to make a mannerly and discreet answer without entangling myself.”

of Glasgow the very Sunday the proclamation was read. Dr. Fall, principal of the University of Glasgow, had an audience of the prince in London, and remonstrated against the western rabblings. William referred him for relief to the coming Convention.¹

On the 14th March 1689 the Convention met in Edinburgh. Legal obstacles had been overcome in the election of its members precisely as the Stuarts had overcome them by royal prerogative. William arbitrarily changed the mode of election by dispensing with the obligation of the Test Act. The Convention numbered a hundred and fifty members from the Three Estates, including the two archbishops and seven bishops. The first trial of strength was on the election of a president. The Whig duke of Hamilton, the same who had advised Charles II. at the Restoration, was elected by 95 votes against 55 for the Tory marquis of Atholl, who was the royalist candidate. Hamilton endeavoured to persuade the primate and the bishop of Edinburgh to cast in their lot, for the sake of the Church, with the prince of Orange, assuring them that he had the prince's word that nothing would be done to the prejudice of Episcopacy if the bishops would support him as the Church of England was doing.²

On the 16th March letters were received and read in the Convention both from king James and from William. The king offered a free pardon to all who should return to their allegiance within a month, and denounced as traitors those who should not. William expressed his desire that the Convention should settle the religion and

¹ Burnet, iv. 40; Skinner, ii. 520, 521.

² Dr. Cook, in his *History of the Church of Scotland*, iii. 440, admits that "the inclination of William himself was to continue Episcopacy," and that had the Episcopalians acknowledged

him as their lawful sovereign, "there can be little doubt that he would have earnestly contended for the continuance of the hierarchy; and it is probable that, by his influence, this continuance would have been accomplished."

liberties of the nation upon a broad and liberal basis. A gracious reply was returned to the prince ; no royalist was so bold as to suggest a reply to the king.

Several of the royalists at this stage left the Convention. Among them was viscount Dundee, who had proposed a rival Convention at Stirling. Frustrated in this, he climbed the castle rocks for an interview with the duke of Gordon,¹ who held the castle for king James. In the afternoon of that day, 19th March, he was seen riding out of Edinburgh by the Stirling road, followed by fifty or sixty of his troopers, to be heard of again before long.

Relieved of many of the royalists, the Convention made rapid progress. On the 4th April it was declared that king James had forfeited his right to the crown, and that the throne had thus become vacant. On the 11th the crown was offered to William and Mary, and on the 13th all ministers were enjoined to make proclamation accordingly in church, and to pray for the new sovereigns under pain of deprivation. The resolutions were embodied in a document called the Claim of Right, and one of its statements was to the effect "That Prelacy and the superiority of any office in the Church above Presbyters is, and hath been, a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to this nation, and contrary to the inclination of the generality of the people, ever since the Reformation (they having been reformed from Popery by Presbyters), and therefore ought to be abolished." William and Mary accepted the crown, and became king and queen of Scotland. The coronation oath was administered to them at Whitehall, the same that had been sworn by Scottish kings from David the Second downwards, the oath framed by the pope in 1329, which required the sovereign to

¹ He was fourth marquis of Huntly, and made duke of Gordon in 1684.

extirpate from his dominions every heretic condemned by the Church. William objected to its conditions; he would be no persecutor, he said, of any man for religion. The earl of Argyll put an ingenious gloss upon it, and the oath was taken.¹

The Presbyterian ministers, opposed as they were to dictation from the civil power touching their prayers, complied with the Convention's enactment and prayed for their majesties. Many of the Episcopal clergy, not regarding them as their lawful sovereigns, refused compliance, and were deprived of their benefices.² The most active agent in the severities against the Episcopal clergy was the covenanting earl of Crawford, the only nobleman who affected the peculiar demeanour and phraseology of the Covenanters, and "whose zeal was not lessened by the circumstance that his family had at one time been enriched by the spoils of the Church."³

These depositions from benefices took place while the Episcopal Church was still by law established. The ministers were deposed as non-jurors, not as Episcopalians. The Revolution had touched the throne and changed the line of its succession; it had not yet touched the Church and its legal status. But so closely were the two connected in the history of the times and by the policy of the prelates, that the one soon went the way of the

¹ *Acts of Parl. Scot.* ix. 1-49; Macaulay, *Hist. Eng.* iii. chap. xiii.; Burton, vii. 294; Cook, *Hist. Ch. Scot.* iii. 447. The cruel penal laws against Roman Catholics, to which king William put his hands, belie his profession of toleration. These laws existed for a long century.

² Three of the Edinburgh ministers were deprived by the Estates during this session.—*Acts Parl. Scot.* ix. 68.

³ Grub, iii. 301. Cunningham says "his poverty and puritanism

made him the butt of the keenest satire of the Prelatists."—*Hist. Ch. Scot.* ii. 278. See also Macaulay, who says—"To those who judge of a man rather by his actions than his words, Crawford will appear to have been a selfish politician, who was not at all the dupe of his own cant, and whose zeal against Episcopal government was not a little whetted by his desire to obtain a grant of Episcopal domains."—*Hist. Eng.* iii. 296.

other. At a meeting of the Estates, the 2nd July (1689), an Act was introduced by the earl of Annandale for the "abolition of Prelacy and of all superiority of any office in the Church above Presbyters, reserving to their majesties to settle the Presbyterian government in the way most agreeable to the inclinations of the people and the Word of God." Next day, it was agreed after discussion to drop the word "Presbyterian" out of the clause concerning the government of the Church; and two days afterwards it was further whittled away by omitting the reference to the Word of God. The latter part of the clause as amended stood thus: That "the king and queen (not the Church in conclave assembled) were to settle the government of the Church in the way most agreeable to the inclinations of the people."

What the inclinations of the people were had still to be determined, but on this opportunist basis the Church of the Revolution was founded. The next ecclesiastical revolution may proceed from the same premiss to a different conclusion.

On the 2nd July, while the draft of the Act was being considered, an address was presented by the earl of Kintore from James Gordon, still the energetic parson of Banchory-Devenick, and John Barclay, minister of Cruden, as commissioners from the diocesan synod of Aberdeen. In the address they earnestly supplicated the Estates to convene a free General Assembly for the rectifying the disorders, healing the divisions, and settling the polity of the Church. The duke of Hamilton favoured the Aberdeen address, but the Presbyterians, headed by lord Crawford, at once took alarm and opposed with might and main the calling of an Assembly, though it was their own ideal convention. The reason was plain. The Episcopal clergy would have outnumbered and outvoted

the Presbyterians by six to one. The Parliament must therefore prescribe the polity of the Church. So it was argued and settled in that day. After this nothing need be said of Erastianism. "The pattern of the new tabernacle," as Dr. Cunningham has put it, "was prescribed in the Parliament house."¹

During the sitting of Parliament news reached Edinburgh of the battle of Killiecrankie, fought on the 27th July (1689). Dundee had rallied the Highland clans in Atholl and defeated general Mackay (Hugh Mackay of Scoury), a veteran officer who had returned with William after thirty years of foreign service.² Wild rumours floated to the capital of the reverse sustained by Mackay, and panic seized the members of Parliament. When it was known that the gallant Dundee had fallen in the hour of victory, the Whigs breathed more freely. His body laid in the church vault of Blair Atholl, Dundee would trouble Whig and Covenanter no more, and their vituperation would not trouble him.

Episcopacy had been disestablished in July (1689), but nothing was set up in its place for nine months, during which the greatest uncertainty prevailed. Ministers, including the bishops, discharged their official duties, and meetings of kirk-sessions, presbyteries, and synods were held as before. On the 15th April 1690, the Parliament met under lord Melville which was to determine the established religion of Scotland for at least two centuries. The Act of 1669, asserting the king's supremacy over all persons and causes, was repealed; the Presbyterian ministers, about sixty in number, who had been deprived since 1661 for nonconformity, were restored, and their

¹ *Act of Parl. Scot.* ix. 98, 104.
Leven and Melville Papers, pp. 137
seq.)

² Dundee had also served under William in Holland, and on one occasion saved his life.

Episcopal successors were ordered to remove from the churches, manses, and glebes before Whitsunday ensuing. On the 26th May the Westminster Confession of Faith was approved as the creed of the Church, and on the 7th June the king and queen, and the Three Estates of the peers, barons, and burgesses, ratified the Confession and established the Presbyterian form of government and discipline.¹

Nothing was said of the Westminster Catechisms and Directory ; and the Covenants which had distracted the peace of the Church for fifty years were allowed to lapse, much to the disappointment of some who would have rejoiced in their renewal. The thorny question of patronage was to have been left unsettled by desire of the king, who had hoped to accommodate the Episcopal clergy within the new establishment. Political exigencies and the pressure of the leading Presbyterians under lord Melville overruled this intention. A statute was passed on the 19th July conferring the patronage of livings upon the heritors and elders, subject to the congregation's appeal to the presbytery, whose decision was to be final. In royal burghs, the patronage was vested in the town council and kirk session. Patrons deprived of their patronage by the Act were to receive in compensation from the parish the sum of 600 merks, equal to £35.² William is said to have bitterly rued his surrender of the power of patronage at a time when ecclesiastical jealousies were so rife between Presbyterians and Episcopalians. One effect of the new statute was gradually to sever the Episcopalians from all connection with the Establishment. Anomalous and unsatisfactory as the relations of the two parties had often been within the same Church, still from 1560 to 1690 there

¹ *Acts Parl. Scot.* ix. 111 and 115.

² *Ibid.* pp. 106 *seq.* ; *Leven and*

Melville Papers, pp. 414-438 ; Wodrow, *Analecta*, i. 275, 276.

had been no formal severance between them. They were effectually severed by the Act of 1690, restoring the sixty surviving ministers deprived in 1661, and investing them, and such ministers and elders as they might admit, with the entire government of the Church.

There is a sense in which it may be truly said that this Establishment of Presbytery in 1690 was the work of the Scottish bishops. Contemporary evidence makes it abundantly clear that had the bishops supported king William, king William would have supported the bishops, and the Episcopal Church on a broader basis and with a more tolerant policy would have continued the legal establishment in Scotland. The bishops have been justified as having acted conscientiously, and in the light of their personal sacrifices this may be freely conceded. But the concession by no means clears them from blame. A man may act conscientiously and yet very culpably. The bishops were then the sole responsible representatives of the Church in Scotland, and should have had more regard to its corporate interests and less to those of one man even though he was their king. A king has obligations to a nation, as a nation has to a king. King James had violated his obligations over and over again, in affairs of both Church and State, to the detriment of no portion of his dominions more than of Scotland. If ever a sovereign had forfeited all claim to the allegiance of his subjects, James VII. was that sovereign. His flight from the country was, besides, tantamount to an abdication of sovereignty, which relieved his subjects from their allegiance. The statesmen and ecclesiastics, who took this view of their duty and supported William of Orange, were not destitute of political rectitude any more than were the Jacobites. The Scottish bishops of the Revolution may be deservedly honoured for their conscientious loyalty to James, but

their sacrifice of the Episcopal Church as an Establishment was a blunder on their part of the gravest magnitude. It may be as truly said of them as of the rulers of the Gallican Church in the next century that they "linked the Church's eternal youth to the fortunes of a dying dynasty."

CHAPTER XX

REIGN OF WILLIAM III. AND MARY, 1689-1702

Jacobitism of Episcopal Church—Representative ecclesiastics since Reformation—Carstares and the Presbyterian Establishment—Relative numbers of Episcopalians and Presbyterians at Revolution—Classes and districts favourable to Episcopacy—First Assembly for thirty-seven years—Its component members and legislation—Assembly receives king's letter and welcomes three Cameronian ministers—Opposition of Covenanters to Assembly—Lawrence Charteris on national sins—Presbytery filling vacant charges—Opposition to Presbyterian ministers—Glenorchy as an example—Episcopalians remonstrate with the king against Presbyterian intolerance—King's reply—Assembly refuses to tolerate Episcopal clergy—Glencoe massacre—Persecution of Episcopalians, Quakers, Romanists—Oaths of Allegiance and Assurance—Threatened mutiny of ministers before Assembly of 1694—Carstares intercepts king's despatches—Opposition of Episcopal clergy to Presbyterian Commission—Consecration of bishop Nicolson 1695, first Scoto-Roman bishop since Reformation—Number of Scottish Romanists—Ministry of Episcopal clergy forbidden—Indulgence offered them—Execution of Aikenhead—Witches again prominent—Parliamentary Act for parish schools 1696—Barrier Act—Rabbling Act—Heresy of Madame Bourignon—King William's death—His public administration and private character.

THE Episcopal Church was sent disestablished into the wilderness to be chastened and purified. Her discipline there was not for forty but for a hundred long years. Not until the death of prince Charles Edward in 1788—a whole century from the Revolution Settlement—was the Episcopal Church finally weaned from an alliance which had leavened her with worldliness, crippled her as an Establishment, and, finally, reduced her to a feeble

remnant. Principle and patriotism were not wanting in this devotion of Scottish Episcopalians to their native line of kings, for they were as loyal to the Stuarts in adversity as in prosperity. Infatuated as it was, and all but fatal to the cause of Episcopacy, and little deserving as the Stuarts were of such devoted loyalty, still, the element of romance in the Jacobite episode will always atone in some degree for its folly.

From the Reformation to the Revolution there had been a succession of prominent ecclesiastics who swayed the counsels and shaped the policy of the Church. Knox represents the transition polity of the Reformation; Adamson, the titular Episcopate; Melville, Presbyterian parity; Spottiswoode, the canonical Episcopate; Henderson, the Covenants; Sharp, Leighton, and Scougal, the Episcopacy of the Restoration. At the Revolution the Episcopal Church was without a capable leader. Ross, the primate, had none of the qualities of leadership; and Paterson, archbishop of Glasgow, though a much abler man, was a violent partizan of the fallen dynasty, and in private life not much respected or trusted. The only other bishop of any note was Rose of Edinburgh, estimable and kindly but without ruling capacity, who outlived all his episcopal contemporaries. In the absence of competent leaders the Church's policy was one of aimless drift; sustained by nothing but devotion to the fallen line of the Stuarts. The Presbyterians at the Revolution were more fortunate in the leadership of William Carstares—his friends called him "Cardinal Carstares"—a man of great practical sagacity, more of a statesman than a churchman, and singularly honourable and upright both in public and in private life. He had great weight in the counsels of the king, and the ultimate establishment of Presbyterianism was largely due to his influence with William,

who honoured and trusted him as he did few of his subjects. If Andrew Melville be historically the first father of Presbyterianism in Scotland, Carstares is its second; and in some respects the second was better than the first.

The Episcopal Church passed at once under a cloud. The bishops continued their ministrations "with mournful privacy," shrinking from the public gaze. Viscount Dundee, in his search for the primate, after the Convention of 1689, said facetiously that the bishops had become "the Kirk invisible." Many of the clergy were not indisposed to acknowledge king William for the sake of securing law and order in the land. Some of them were willing also, for the sake of peace, to submit to Presbyterian government, and William would gladly have embraced them all in the new Establishment, but the Presbyterian ministers were not disposed to accommodate the Episcopal incumbents, even to please the king, and on several occasions resisted his efforts for a compromise. Their attitude presents a contrast to the policy adopted at the Restoration, when Presbyterians were not only made welcome in the Episcopal Church, but their ministers made bishops in its hierarchy. The majority of the episcopal clergy remained Jacobites, and opposed any compromise with the new government, reasoning that if James had forfeited the throne their loyalty was still due to his son and heir. Holding the higher views of Episcopacy that had prevailed since the Restoration, they were equally opposed to the Presbyterian polity. The episcopal laity were numerically divided in much the same proportions as the clergy between the old and the new governments.

The relative number of Episcopalians and of Presbyterians in Scotland at the Revolution has been the subject

of frequent debate, and can even now be only approximately determined. It has been assumed by some that because Presbytery is said in the Claim of Right to have been established in accordance with the inclinations of the people, therefore the supporters of Presbytery were in a majority. The statement is only proof of the party spirit of the time, and it would with as much certainty have been made of the Episcopalians, had the bishops accepted William's offer and Episcopacy remained established. Proof of relative numbers must be sought elsewhere. In the reign of James VII., after that monarch had relieved Presbyterians of all penalties in restraint of their public worship, not one-third of the people, except in the five western counties, took advantage of the Act, and there was hardly a meeting-house in the whole of Scotland north of the Tay. Burton¹ remarks—"Had the religious powers in the country been permitted, with some modification and restraint, to adjust themselves, Episcopacy would have prevailed north of the Tay; in Fife and along the east coast a moderate Presbyterianism might have developed itself," while the south-west was largely Covenanting. Better evidence is supplied by two prominent contemporaries from the opposite sides. Lord Tarbet, afterwards earl of Cromarty, an Episcopalian, writing in 1689, says—"The matter of Church government hath been made a pretence for the troubles of Scotland now for a hundred years. Episcopacy appears insufferable to a great party, and Presbytery is as odious to another. The Presbyterians are the more zealous and hotter; the other more numerous and powerful. The present Parliament is more numerous of Presbyterians by the new method of election of burghs, but the major part of the nobility and barons are not for Presbytery."² General

¹ *Hist. Scot.* vii. 433.

² *Leven and Melville Papers*, p. 125.

Mackay, writing on the 4th December 1690 to the laird of Grant, who was, like himself, a zealous Presbyterian, says—"Let men flatter themselves as they will, I tell you who know Scotland, and where the strength and weakness of it doth lie, that if I were as much an enemy to that interest (the Presbyterian) as I am a friend, I would without difficulty engage to form in Scotland a more formidable party against it, even for their majesties' government, than can be formed for it."¹ If the section of Episcopalians favourable to William's government was as formidable as Mackay represents them, and he had no reason to exaggerate their influence, the united body of Episcopalians, Jurors and Non-jurors, must have formed a considerable majority of the population.

Bishop Sage, also a contemporary, gives evidence to the same effect. He says that "not fifty gentlemen in all Scotland (out of the west) did, upon the Indulgence, forsake the Church to frequent the meeting-house." On the question whether, as stated in the Claim of Right, prelacy was an insupportable grievance to the people, he remarks—"This inquiry is about a very recent matter of fact. Sure I am there was no other thing (than the rabblings in the western counties) done then, that with the least show of probability could be called an indication of the 'inclinations of the people.' There were no such clamours in the mouths of the twentieth part of the people." And "granting that all the people in these counties (the five western) had been so inclined, yet what were they to the whole nation?" "In the years 1687 and 1688 when the schism was in its elevation there were but some three or four Presbyterian meeting-houses erected on the north side of the Tay, *i.e.* in the greater half of the

¹ Letter in Register House, Edinburgh, published by Dr. Jos. Robertson in *Scot. Eccles. Journal*, vii. 22, 23.

kingdom, and these, too, very little frequented, and that on the south side of that river (except in the five western shires) the *third* man was never engaged in the schism."¹ The bishop is confirmed by a Presbyterian writer, Dr. Carlyle, minister of Inveresk, in his autobiography. When a youth he had witnessed the battle of Prestonpans in 1745. His father, then parish minister of Inveresk, was born in 1690, and was probably acquainted with men who had passed through the Revolution struggle. Carlyle² remarks incidentally—"It must be observed, too, that when Presbytery was re-established in Scotland at the Revolution, after the reign of Episcopacy for twenty-nine years, more than two-thirds of the people of the country, and most part of the gentry, were Episcopal." These statements entirely dispose of the popular notion industriously fostered in Scotland that the Presbyterians formed a large majority, or any majority at all, at the Revolution, and that Episcopacy at the Restoration was tyrannically imposed upon a nation of Presbyterians.³

The Scottish nobility and gentry at the Revolution were mostly Episcopalians. So were the senators of the College of Justice, and the professors in the Universities, almost without exception. A special Act was passed in 1690 for the Universities which required the principals, professors, regents, and masters to take the oaths of Allegiance, subscribe the Westminster Confession, and submit to Presbyterian government. A commission under the Act visited the Universities of St. Andrews, Glasgow, and Edinburgh, in the summer of 1690. The

¹ Sage's *Fundamental Charter of Presbytery* (Spott. Society), vol. i. Preface, pp. 72, 73, 311-322.

² *Autobiography*, p. 249.

³ If Episcopalians were so numerous at the Revolution, presumably

they bore about the same proportion at the Restoration, otherwise we must suppose that the Episcopal Church between 1661 and 1689 converted a feeble minority into a formidable majority.

result of the commission was that most of the principals and professors were ejected from their chairs and thrown penniless upon the world.¹ The commission visited Aberdeen in October, and, contrary to what might have been expected in that traditional haven of Episcopacy, most of the professorial staff of the two colleges, King's and Marischal, submitted to the Act.²

The most eminent of the ejected professors was Dr. Gregory, who held the mathematical chair in Edinburgh, and afterwards became Savilian professor of Astronomy in Oxford.³ Dr. Fall, principal of Glasgow, was made precentor of York cathedral.⁴ Dr. Monro, the principal of Edinburgh college, and one of the city ministers, was bishop-designate of Argyll at the Revolution. He was accused, among other things, of using the English Book of Common Prayer in the college. His defence shows that he used it neither in the college nor in the High Church, of which he was minister. After the Revolution he and others did use it every Sunday, and he adds that people came "by hundreds more than we had room for, and that very many became acquainted with the Liturgy of the Church of England." One result of the Church's liberation was the gradual bringing into use of the English Prayer Book among the non-juring congregations.⁵

¹ *Munimenta Alma Univ. Glasg.* ii. 501-509; Irving's *Scot. Writers*, ii. 149.

² Dr. James Garden, professor of divinity in King's college, held office until 1697, and was then deprived for not subscribing the Confession, *Fasti Aberdonenses*, pp. 361-368, 379, 380.

³ Bower's *Hist. Univ. Edinburgh*, i. 313-316.

⁴ He edited the works of archbishop Leighton, *Munimenta Alma Univ. Glasg.* ii. 501-509; Irving's *Scot. Writers*, ii. 149.

⁵ Sage's "Principles of Cyprianic Age," *Works*, i. 37, and iii. 494, published in 1701. See also *Fasti Eccles. Scot.* i. 27, 28. For the introduction of the Prayer Book see Chambers's *Dom. Annals*, iii. 65, where the case is reported of two clergymen in Dumfries who, for using the Prayer Book on a Sunday in February 1692, were dragged out of town by "a party of about sixteen mean country persons" and severely beaten. One of the books was publicly burned at the cross.

The Sovereign had appointed a meeting of the General Assembly in October. As it had not been constituted for thirty-seven years, since the day that Cromwell's troopers dispersed it, a preliminary meeting was held in Edinburgh. The governing body of the Presbyterian Church now consisted of the surviving ministers ejected at the Restoration, numbering about sixty, and playfully styled "The Sixty Bishops." They were not in harmony among themselves, for while they were agreed in a common opposition to Episcopacy, some represented the Protester and some the Resolutioner faction. The situation was further complicated by the fact that several of the Protesters had been excommunicated by their own judicatories, and the Resolutioners now insisted that they should be formally purged from ecclesiastical censure. The wholesome fear of injuring their cause by internal dissension, and giving an advantage to the Episcopalians made them close their ranks. The governing body was now enlarged, if not strengthened, by the addition of a number of hot-headed youths hastily admitted to the ministry under the emergency of the Revolution ejections.¹ Presbyteries were also empowered to purge the Church of "scandalous, erroneous, and negligent ministers," the presbyteries in each case being both accusers and judges in the trial and deposition of the Episcopal incumbents.

The Assembly met at Edinburgh on the 16th October 1690. Lord Carmichael was the king's commissioner, and Gabriel Cunningham, an aged minister, was chosen

¹ Dr. Carlyle of Inveresk, in his *Autobiography*, p. 249, gives no better account of these youthful entrants on the ministry than has been given of the "Curates" that came from the north to the south-west to fill the vacant incumbencies at the Restoration. He says—"The sudden call

for young men to fill up vacancies at the Revolution, obliged the Church to take their entrants from the lower ranks, who had but a mean education." See also M'Cormick's *Life of Carstairs*, p. 50, on the illiterate character of the new Presbyterian ministers.

moderator. About a hundred and eighty ministers and elders were present ; none from beyond the Tay, and only one, Dr. Rule, the newly elected principal of Edinburgh, from the Universities. Few noblemen and gentry appeared in the Assembly, and those who did had already been urgent in counselling the leading ministers to a policy of moderation. The king's letter to the Assembly was in the same strain. "We expect," it said, "that your management shall be such as we shall have no reason to repent of what we have done. A calm and peaceable procedure will be no less pleasing to us than it becometh you. We never could be of the mind that violence was suited to the advancing of true religion ; nor do we intend that our authority shall ever be a tool to the irregular passions of any party. Moderation is what religion enjoins, neighbouring churches expect from, and we recommend to you."¹ Moderation was William's watchword, and the presence of Carstares, though he was not a member of the Assembly, largely helped to guide its deliberations in the desired channel. The ministers were, to their credit, more moderate in counsel on the floor of the Assembly than in their action throughout the presbyteries of the country.

The first business of importance was the receiving into the Church the three remanent Cameronian ministers—Shields, Lining, and Boyd. They presented to the Assembly two papers, but the longer one was suppressed as containing "several peremptory and gross mistakes, unreasonable and impracticable proposals, and uncharitable and injurious reflections." The reflections hit many members of the Assembly, and it was deemed prudent to bury the hatchet. The three ministers were received into the Church, but their flocks in the west were of a different mind. They would have no fellowship with the general

¹ *Acts of Assembly*, ed. 1843, p. 222.

body of Presbyterians until they had publicly **confessed** and deplored their backslidings from the **Covenants**. Hamilton of Preston, their leader at Drumclog, **Rutherglen**, and Bothwell, who had fled to Holland after the rout of Bothwell, was again in Scotland, and as **resolute** a **Covenanter** as ever. Under his influence a document was drawn up and a deputation despatched to present it to the Assembly. It lamented the sinful compliance with a king who had not taken the Covenants, nor engaged to extirpate prelacy in England and Ireland, and with ministers who had joined hands with prelatie hirelings and accepted an indulgence from a miserable mortal, instead of owning the sole supremacy of Christ their covenanted King. This inflammatory document never got further than the committee of Overtures. It illustrates the impracticable and intolerant spirit of the Covenanting laity and their attitude towards their ministers, whom they regarded as mere mouthpieces of their own opinions rather than as spiritual guides.¹

An Act of this Assembly required all ministers, probationers, and elders to subscribe the Westminster Confession,² and another forbade private communion of the sick, and baptisms in the house. Two commissions of visitation were nominated, the one for the presbyteries north of the Tay, and the other for the southern presbyteries, to take order with them as to the "scandalous and negligent ministers," in other words, the Episcopal clergy who still held parishes. The Assembly before rising

¹ Shield's *Faithful Contendings*, pp. 439 *seq.*

² It is often asserted that the Episcopal Church, from the Restoration to the Revolution, accepted the Westminster Confession. It was in fact a dead letter from 1661 to 1689, as dead as the Covenants,

until re-enacted by Parliament in 1689. The clergy who objected to the milder Confession of 1560 when imposed under the Test Act were not likely to accept the Westminster Confession. See Grub, iii. 334, note.

appointed the second Thursday in January (1691) as a solemn fast for the sins of the nation; and among the national sins were included the recent establishment of prelacy and the decay of true godliness resulting therefrom. The fast-day was sanctioned and enjoined by the Privy Council, which still intermeddled in things ecclesiastical as it had done under Episcopacy. But no outcry was now made about Erastianism.

One eminent minister, Lawrence Charteris, has recorded his opinion of the national sins. He was the friend of Leighton and the supporter of his policy of conciliation, but so much opposed to the Test Act of 1681 that he resigned his professorship of divinity in Edinburgh University.¹ Burnet says that "he was a perfect friend and most sublime Christian," "often moved to accept a bishopric but always refused it." He was now minister of Dirleton, and upon the fast-day he expressed himself as follows—"All who are wise and have a right sense of true religion and Christianity cannot but see that there has been a great defection among us. The defection has not been from the truth, or from the fundamental articles of the Christian Faith, but from the life of God and the power of religion, and from the temper and conversation which the Gospel requires in us. But yet I cannot think that the settling of an imparity among the officers of the Church is to be looked upon as a defection, or that it is a thing in itself unlawful, or that it is of itself introductory of the abounding of wickedness and scandals in the Church. This I may with the greatest confidence affirm, that religion never flourished more in the world than it did when and where there was an imparity among the officers of the Church."²

¹ Dalziel's *Hist. of University*,
Ed. ii. 335.

² Charteris's *Discourse, in Second
Part of Case of the Episcopal Clergy*,

For the next twenty years the Assembly was busy through its commissions and presbyteries filling vacant charges. The work was sooner and more easily accomplished in the south than in the north, where the Episcopal incumbents were supported by the great bulk of the people. Many of the southern clergy had already been ejected by rabbling, and some of them had gone to England and Ireland, others to the American colonies. North of the Tay the Episcopalians continued in possession, and for some years defied the presbyteries, even with the aid of the military, to put them out. In the south many of the charges remained vacant for some time for want of "qualified" ministers. In the presbyteries of Haddington and Dunbar, with nearly thirty parishes, there were only five Presbyterian ministers; in those of Duns and Chirnside about the same number; in the presbytery of Cupar, of twenty ministers only one accepted the oath; in Auchterarder presbytery only one; and in the whole of Perthshire there were only three ministers who would conform to the Presbyterian establishment.¹ In Galloway the churches were nearly all closed, "so that when the Assembly met, two ministers declared before them that where they lived there was not so much as the face of a church, there being no ministers but themselves and one other."²

The last decade of this century was chiefly occupied with the deposing of Episcopal and the settling of Presbyterian ministers. Many were deposed for not praying for king William, or for praying in ambiguous language, like the minister of Cupar, who "having a mixed auditory prayed so as he might please both parties." Some were

pp. 37-40; Fasti, *Eccles. Scot.* i. 327; Burnet, *Hist. Own Times*, i. 216; Chambers's *Dom. Annals*, iii. 41, 42; Lawson, *Hist. of Ep. Ch.*

after Revolution, p. 154.

¹ M'Cormick's *Life of Carstares*, p. 41.

² Lawson, p. 135.

deposed for not accepting the Confession of Faith ; others, again, on the most frivolous pretexts, such as that they had recommended to their parishioners Scougal's *Catechism*, or *The Whole Duty of Man* ; had repeated the Creed or sung the Doxology ; had spoken well of the bishops or ill of the Covenant.¹ In Dunfermline, Haddington, and other places there was a compromise, and the Episcopal and Presbyterian ministers officiated by turns.

The following account of an attempted settlement in Glenorchy might be paralleled from other parts² :—"The last Episcopal clergyman of the parish of Glenorchy, Mr. David Lindsay, was ordered to surrender his charge to a Presbyterian minister then appointed by the earl of Argyll. When the new minister reached the parish to take possession of his living, not an individual would speak to him, except Mr. Lindsay, who received him kindly. On Sunday the new clergyman went to church accompanied by his predecessor. The whole population of the district were assembled, but they would not enter the church. No person spoke to the new minister, nor was there the least noise or violence till he attempted to enter the church, when he was surrounded by twelve men fully armed, who told him he must accompany them ; and, disregarding all Mr. Lindsay's prayers and entreaties, they ordered the piper to play the march of death, and marched away the minister to the confines of the parish. Here they made him swear on the Bible that he would never return or attempt to disturb Mr. Lindsay. He kept his oath. The synod of Argyll was highly incensed at this violation of its authority ; but seeing that the people were fully determined to resist, no further attempt was made, and Mr.

¹ Thos. Stephen's *Hist. of Ch. Scot.* iii. 525 ; Skinner's *Eccles. Hist.* ii. 558.

² The presbytery minutes of Ding-

wall record several instances similar to Glenorchy. In Coldingham the Presbyterian minister was inducted and supported by military.

Lindsay lived thirty years afterwards, and died Episcopal minister of Glenorchy, loved and revered by his flock."¹

The commissions continued their work of purging the Church with equal zeal and severity. Only occasionally were they frustrated in their policy of "Thorough," as on their visitation of Aberdeen in March 1691, when they were so roughly handled by a mob, encouraged by the upper classes, that they had to make a precipitate retreat.²

The Episcopalians, aware that the severity of the commissions was contrary to the orders of the king, sent a deputation to him in Flanders where he was with the army. They returned with letters from William to the Council and to the commissions, in which he insisted upon a more tolerant procedure, and the acceptance of such of the Episcopal clergy as had submitted to the government in Church and State. The royal letters were treated with scant respect; the ministers were not to be restrained by Erastian interference from cleansing the temple. The work of purgation went on as before, and a second remonstrance from William had no better effect.³

The Assembly had been adjourned till November 1691, and when the time came it was further adjourned by the king, much to the irritation of the members. When it met on 15th January 1692 there were present 111 ministers and 54 ruling elders, most of them from south of the Tay, the northern presbyteries being still mere skeletons.⁴ The king wrote two letters, one for the

¹ Stewart's *Sketches of the Highlands*, i. 99 note, cited by Chambers's *Dom. Ann.* iii. 7, and Sir John Sinclair's *Stat. Acct. of Scot.* viii. 354, 355; Lawson, pp. 144, 145. For other cases of ejectment see Lawson, pp. 128-144.

² *Leven and Melville Papers*, p. 606; Burton, vii. 441.

³ The king's letters were sent in

February and in June 1691, the former from the Hague and the latter from Anderlecht.

⁴ "A much better reason (than the wintry season) for no Presbyterians coming from the north is simply that there were no Presbyterians to come."—Cunningham, *Ch. Hist. Scot.* ii. 298.

Assembly and the other for the Episcopal clergy. The former was read by lord Lothian, the royal commissioner, and was characterised by very plain speaking on the part of "the saturnine monarch." He referred to his letters from Flanders, to their disregard of his wishes, and to the breach of their own assurances touching the Episcopal clergy. Of their present Assembly he said—"It has been represented to us that you are not a full General Assembly, there being as great a number of the ministers of the Church of Scotland as you are who are not allowed to be represented." He enjoined that the Episcopal clergy should be admitted upon signing a formula and declaration which he had prepared, and that the two commissions for settling ministers should be composed equally of Presbyterians and Episcopalians. His letter to the Episcopal clergy stated that he had favourably received the assurances of their loyalty conveyed by Dr. Canaries.¹ A deputation of Episcopal ministers from Aberdeen made application as prescribed by the king to the Assembly, craving admission into the Established Church. The application was referred to a committee, from which it never emerged. Only one Episcopal minister was received, and he in the garb of a penitent, who made confession that he had been always a Presbyterian at heart.²

After a month's fruitless endeavour to persuade the Assembly to admit conforming Episcopal clergy, the commissioner dissolved it by the king's command on the 13th February. The Presbyterians can hardly be blamed

¹ Dr. Canaries, at the head of one hundred and eighty Episcopal ministers, and in the name of many more, appeared and desired to be received on subscribing the formula acknowledging the Presbyterian standards. Shaw's *History of Moray*, cited by Lawson, p. 164. In July 1693 Dr. Canaries held the English

benefice of Abington, to which he was presented by king William, who also made him one of his chaplains in ordinary. See authorities cited in Charles Wordsworth's *Who wrote Icon Basilike?* pp. 143, 144.

² Burton, vii. 450-452; Burnet, *History*, iv. 150, 151; Lawson, pp. 164-166.

for not seeing eye to eye with the king in his politic scheme of accommodation. They were well aware, as Dr. Cunningham has expressed it, "that notwithstanding all the ejections which had taken place the Episcopalians still formed a majority in the Church, and that if they were admitted to a vote in the Church's judicatories they might frame and fashion matters as they pleased. The sceptre which they (the Presbyterians) now held would depart from them."¹ The moderator disputed the commissioner's right to dissolve the Assembly without summoning a new one. The commissioner would only now permit him to speak as a private member, whereupon he was urged by many voices to fix a day for the next Assembly, which he did by naming the third Wednesday in August 1693, amidst the applause of the house. The king, when he heard of it, upbraided Presbytery for its arrogance, and Presbytery in return reviled the king for his Erastianism. No Assembly was held in August 1693, and even the proceedings of this Assembly of 1692 are "blotted out of the precedents of the Church, and the acknowledged Acts of the Assembly stride from the Assembly of 1690 to that of 1694."²

The massacre of Glencoe diverted the attention of the nation for a time from Church politics. MacDonald, a subordinate chief of the clan, had taken the oaths of allegiance in the early days of January 1692. His submission should have been made before the expiry of 1691, but the natives of the glen felt secure in the belief that peace had been made with the Government. Soldiers were quartered upon them in February, yet no suspicion of treachery was aroused, and for twelve days the military freely enjoyed the hospitality of the doomed people, down to the morning of the tragedy. MacDonald was shot as he was dressing to receive the officer who had ostensibly

¹ *Hist. Ch. Scot.* ii. 300.

² Burton, vii. 449.

called as a friend. Others were dragged from their beds and murdered in cold blood—thirty-eight in all, including an old man, a woman, and a boy. Several escaped to the hills, where not a few perished from cold and hunger. If the arrangements had not miscarried, the intention to massacre all the men of Glencoe would probably have been carried out. The king was freed from blame only by the plea of his friends—bishop Burnet, for example—that he had signed the warrant without having read it. An investigation was made under royal commission, but it is remarkable that neither of the chief persons, Dalrymple of Stair and Campbell of Glenlyon, implicated in the massacre was subjected to any direct punishment. William had never been popular as a ruler in Scotland, and the affair of Glencoe damaged his reputation both at home and on the Continent.¹

The Revolution government was professedly based upon "civil and religious liberty," but in Scotland it soon belied its profession. The declaration of the Estates in its Claim of Right, April 1689, asserted that "the imprisoning of persons without expressing the reasons thereof, and delaying to put them to trial, is contrary to law," and it also pronounced as equally illegal "the using of torture without evidence in ordinary crimes." This was meant as a condemnation of the late government; it became equally condemnatory of William's rule. "It could not but be vexing," writes Dr. R. Chambers,² "to the men who had delivered their country 'from thralldom and poperie, and the pernicious inconveniences of ane absolute power,' when they found themselves—doubtless under a full sense of the necessity of the case, probably as much so as their predecessors had ever felt—ordering something like half

¹ Burton, vii. 398-412; Chambers, *Dom. Annals*, iii. 60-64.

² *Domestic Annals*, iii. 11.

the nobility and gentry of the country, and many people of inferior rank, into ward, there to lie without trial—and in at least one notorious case, had to resort to torture to extort confession; thus imitating those very proceedings of the late government which they themselves had condemned. All through the summer of 1689 the register of the Privy Council is crammed with petitions from the imprisoned, calling for some degree of relief from the miseries they were subjected to in the Edinburgh tolbooth, Stirling castle, Blackness castle, and other places of confinement, to which they had been consigned, generally without intimation of a cause.”¹

It is a trite saying that history repeats itself, but it is not generally known that the history of Charles II. and James VII. repeated itself in Scotland in the first years of William III. The imprisonment of so many Jacobites awakens memories of the Covenanters who were subjected to a similar ordeal. The Bass Rock, once familiar to the Covenanters, became the prison of four of Dundee's officers (captured on Speyside in the skirmish at Cromdale) who disowned the sovereignty of William, as the others had disowned that of Charles and James. The romance that attaches to “Bonnie Dundee” followed the four cavaliers to the Bass. In June 1691, while the little garrison were employed outside the walls, the four Jacobite prisoners closed the gates, took possession of the fortress, and with the aid of friends outside and French galleys, held it in defiance of the government until the spring of 1694, when they capitulated with honours, receiving even arrears of aliment as prisoners. This was the last of the Bass Rock as a State prison.²

¹ For the imprisonment of Jacobites see Chambers, *Dom. Annals*, iii. 10-15, 66-68.

² Burton, vii. 414-418; Chambers, *Dom. Annals*, iii. 95-97.

The imprisonment and torture of Carstares have also their counterpart in the similar treatment of Neville Payne in this reign. He was an English country gentleman and a Roman Catholic, and, being implicated in a plot to restore king James, was seized in Dumfries and brought to Edinburgh. The Privy Council records show that he was subjected to torture on the 6th August 1690, and again on the 10th December, when he was tortured under instructions signed by the king and countersigned by the earl of Melville.¹

The process is thus described by the zealous earl of Crawford who presided—"About six this evening we inflicted (the torture) on both thumbs and one of his legs with all the severity that was consistent with humanity, even unto that pitch that we could not preserve life and have gone further, but without the least success. . . . It was surprising to me and others that flesh and blood could without fainting, and in contradiction to the grounds we had insinuat of our knowledge of his accession in matters, endure the heavy penance he was in for two hours."² Payne was kept in prison for ten long years, contrary to law and to the vaunt of liberty in the Claim of Right, and notwithstanding repeated demands for trial or release.³

The Quakers continued to be objects of persecution under the new government. They confessed that it was

¹ The warrant for the torture signed by William is dated at Kensington Palace. It is printed in the *State Trials*, x. 753.

² Melville *Correspondence*, p. 582. Privy Council Record; Burton, vii. 349. Dr. R. Chambers makes the following suggestive remarks on Payne's case: "The earl (of Crawford) states that he regarded Payne's constancy under torture as solely owing to his being assured by his religion that it would save his soul

and place him among the saints. His lordship would never have imagined such self-consideration as supporting a westland Whig on the ladder in the Grassmarket."—*Dom. Annals*, iii. 40, 41.

³ During this time he became acquainted with the principal state prisons in Scotland. He dates one of his petitions from Stirling castle July 1699, and describes himself as "borne down with age, poverty, and a nine years' imprisonment."

a matter of surprise to them that the Presbyterians, "who had complained most of persecution, should now be found acting the parts of their own persecutors against the petitioners" (the Quakers). While they had suffered much "since the change of government through all parts of the nation by beating, stoning, and other abuses, yet in Glasgow (1691) their usage had been liker French dragoons' usage and furious rabbling than anything that dare own the title of Christianity." They state in their petition that on the 12th November, "being met together in their hired house for no other end under heaven than to wait upon and worship their God, a company of Presbyterian elders, attended with the rude rabble of the town, haled them to the baillie, who for no other cause than their said meeting, dragged them to prison, where some of them were kept the space of eight days."¹

Roman Catholic clergy fared no better than Quakers after the Revolution. In April 1693, there were imprisoned one priest in Blackness castle, three in the Edinburgh tolbooth, and another in the Canongate tolbooth. All five had been for many months deprived of liberty for no other crime than being "alleged Popish priests," and were liberated only on consenting to go into exile, giving caution of a hundred pounds not to return. Another priest, John Seaton, had been a prisoner in Blackness since 1688. Now in his seventieth year, and broken in health, he petitioned the Council to take pity on him, "and not permit him, ane old sickly dying man, to languish in prison for the few days he can by the course of nature

¹ The Presbyterians regarded the Quakers with superstitious horror. Peden, the Covenanting seer-preacher, attended a Quakers' meeting in Ireland, and seeing a raven perching itself on the heads of some of the people, he gravely remarked to a

Quaker friend—"I always thought there was devilry amongst you, but I never thought he appeared visibly to you; but now I see it."—Life of Peden, *Biograph. Presbyteriana*, i. 112, and Chambers, *Dom. Annals*, i. 57.

and his disease continue in this life." Seaton was liberated by the Council, and died in 1694, a few months after his discharge.¹

The imprisonment and sufferings of these different classes—Episcopalians, Romanists, and Quakers—sufficiently show that the toleration of the Revolution Settlement was very one-sided, and that persecution for religion did not cease in Scotland with the change of government in Church and State.

The Parliament met 1st April 1693, and its first act was to appoint the third Thursday of each month as a fast for the war which William was waging with France. It then passed the oath of Assurance,² which was imposed upon all persons holding office, civil or ecclesiastical, and required the clergy, both Presbyterian and Episcopal, to swear that William was king both *de jure* and *de facto*. Many Episcopalians had taken the simpler oath of allegiance, which acknowledged the sovereignty of William as a matter of fact without admitting his legal title. The new oath left them no loop-hole, and they unanimously opposed it. More unexpected was the opposition of the Presbyterian ministers, who fully admitted the king's rights of sovereignty. They opposed it on the ground that the secular power had no authority to impose its tests upon them as a condition of exercising their ministry. Another Act was passed in June which still more disturbed the peace of the clergy, though it bore a pacific title—"An Act for settling the Quiet and Peace of the Church." It ordained that no person should be a minister of the Established Church, or a member of its judicatories, unless he had taken both oaths—of Allegiance and of Assurance—subscribed the Westminster Confession, and accepted the Presbyterian government as the only government of

¹ Bellesheim, iv. 125-127.

² *Acts of Parl.* iii. 385-380.

the Church. The Parliament also requested their majesties to call a meeting of the Assembly to settle the affairs of the Church, and to admit to benefices and to the courts of the Established Church such of the Episcopal clergy as should comply with the enactments of this statute.¹

There was every prospect of a mutiny of the ministers at the Assembly. Neither Presbyterian nor Episcopalian would take the oath of Assurance, and the Episcopalians had now a further grievance in the forcing upon them by parliamentary statute a faith and a polity to which they could not in conscience subscribe. The moderator of the previous Assembly had fixed its next meeting for August 1693. The king, ignoring his authority, named the 6th December, and then further adjourned the meeting until 29th March 1694. The members chafed at these repeated summonses and adjournments, and much uneasiness prevailed in view of the meeting. The Presbyterians were firm in their resolve to refuse the Assurance oath, and the king was as resolute to enforce it. Despatches to this effect were sent by William to lord Carmichael, the royal commissioner. Carstares, who had been advised of the bad feeling in Scotland, intercepted the king's courier, took from him the despatches, and hastened to Kensington palace to demand an audience of his majesty. William was in bed, but Carstares insisted upon seeing him, and, when he had wakened the king, fell upon his knees and astonished him by saying he had come to beg for his life. William was at first indignant at his chaplain's audacity. Carstares reasoned with him as to the disaffection of the Presbyterians which his action was certain to increase, and the hostility of the Episcopalians of which there was no doubt. "What," said he, "do oaths and promises avail a

¹ *Acts of Parl. Scot.* ix. 262-264, 303; M'Cormick's *Life of Carstares*, pp. 54-57.

prince when he has lost the hearts of his subjects? Now was the time, therefore, to retrieve his majesty's affairs in that kingdom." William wisely gave way, ordered the despatches to be thrown into the fire, and asked Carstares to write such instructions as he thought fit, and he would sign them. The fresh despatches arrived in Edinburgh on the morning of the Assembly, and great was the rejoicing of the members when their tenor was known.¹

The Presbyterians had every reason to be gratified with their exemption from the Assurance oath. No such relief came to the Episcopalians from the other Act, which was endorsed by the Assembly and at once enforced upon Episcopal clergy, of whom there were still many in legal possession of parishes.² A commission from the Assembly went to Aberdeen in June 1694 to enforce the statute. A large muster of the northern clergy, representatives of seven dioceses, met about the same time in King's college chapel, Aberdeen, and appointed a committee to meet the Assembly's commission. The committee, headed by James Gordon, still parson of Banchory-Devenick, presented two documents, one containing a series of questions challenging the right of fifty or sixty Presbyterian ministers to speak in the name of the Church of Scotland, and the other a formal protest against the recent Assemblies, which they refused to recognise as in any sense representative of the national

¹ The story is given in M'Cormick's *Life of Carstares*, pp. 57-61. See also Burnet's *History*, iv. 171, and Laing's *Hist. of Scot.* ii. 228, 229. Burton in a note, *History*, vii. 456, suggests that the incident has been embellished.

² So late as 1707, eighteen years after the Revolution, there were a hundred and sixty-five Episcopal in-

cumbents ministering in parishes where the local feeling was too strong to permit of their ejection. See De Foe's *Memoirs of Ch. of Scot.* p. 245, and introduction to *Leven and Melville Papers*. Three years later, in 1710, there were north of the Tay a hundred and thirteen Episcopal clergymen.—Burton, vii. 465.

Church.¹ The commissioners declined to answer the defiant queries, and proceeded to Inverness, whereupon the committee appealed to their majesties and to the next lawfully constituted General Assembly. The commissioners' visit to Aberdeen was not, however, fruitless. Several clergy of the Aberdeen diocese submitted; three of the protesters were deprived and imprisoned under warrant of the Privy Council; and possession was obtained, for the first time, of the cathedral at Old Aberdeen.²

The Roman Catholics made a forward move at this time in the consecration at Paris, 27th February 1695, of bishop Nicolson for their Scottish mission. The new bishop had become a convert to Romanism in 1682, previous to which he had been for nearly fourteen years a professor in the University of Glasgow. He was one of several priests imprisoned in Scotland at the Revolution, and after his consecration he returned to his native country to discharge the duties of his higher office.³ This advent of a rival bishop raises the question—not without interest to some—Which line of succession carried with it the historic continuity of the Church? But the question is no sooner asked than it raises others. Is continuity bound up with the Episcopate, or with the Presbyterate through the sacraments, or with the wider priesthood of the laity, the kingdom of priests unto God? If bishops be the essential medium of continuity, the choice lies between the Episcopate that came from London in 1610, and the Episcopate that came from Paris in 1695. In the one

¹ Gordon said "he would as soon acknowledge the conventicle of Trent to have been a true General Council as those of Edinburgh in 1690 and 1692 to have been true National Synods."

² See contemporary pamphlet, *The Queries and Protestations of the Scots Parochial Clergy*, etc., given at

Aberdeen 29th June 1694; *Miscellany* of Spalding Club, ii. 163-171, and Preface i. pp. lxxv.-lxxii.; *Acts. Parl. Scot.* ix. 367 seq.

³ Bellesheim, iv. 146, 147. There was a Mr. Nicolson professor or regent in Glasgow University in 1666. See *Munimenta Univ. Glas.* pp. 335-336.

case there is a blank of fifty years (1560-1610), and in the other of a hundred and thirty-five (1560-1695), and we leave it for the ingenious to say how the span in either case is to be bridged. The canonical priesthood was probably never extinct, and the larger priesthood of the laity crossed the line at the Reformation for better or for worse.

The flock that bishop Nicolson came to rule was not numerous, and chiefly confined to the Highlands and Islands. A report forwarded to Rome in 1681, gives the number of Roman Catholic communicants in Scotland at 14,000, of whom only about 2000 were in the Lowlands; namely, in Banffshire, 1000; in Galloway, 550; in Aberdeenshire, 450; in Forfarshire, 72; in Glasgow and its neighbourhood, 50; and in Morayshire, 28. The other 12,000 were in the Highlands and Hebridean Islands. In bishop Nicolson's second report to Propaganda, September 1698, he states that the missionaries then labouring in Scotland included 23 secular priests, 10 Jesuits, and 4 Benedictines. In his visitation of the Islands made in the year 1700 he found in Eigg 300 members, young and old; in Canna, 130; in Uist, 1500, including the chief of the Macdonalds. In these and other islands of the west the traditional faith still survives among the children of the mist and the storm, and Roman chapels and schools are now dotted all over the Scottish Polynesia.¹

Turning from these minor currents to the main stream of ecclesiastical history, we find the Scottish Parliament passing an Act in 1695, which forbade the deprived ministers (Episcopal) to celebrate baptisms or marriages under pain of imprisonment. This was a repetition of the policy of Charles II., and of similar character was a subsequent Act of the same Parliament, which offered an

¹ Bellesheim, iv. 128, 151, 152.

indulgence to the Episcopal clergy who had not yet taken the oaths of Allegiance and Assurance. An extension of time was allowed them to qualify in the manner prescribed by the Act. Within three months more than a hundred accepted the offer, which was not clogged, as previous indulgences had been, with a promise of conformity to the Presbyterian faith and polity.¹

While ministers were wrangling over ecclesiastical politics, "witches" and infidelity were rife among the people. The Privy Council dealt with the "witches," accused of trafficking with the devil, and issued a commission for the trial of twenty-two of the poor creatures, whose only crime was poverty and misery. By way of striking a blow at infidelity, the Assembly in December 1695 passed an Act against the profession of atheistical opinions. It received a melancholy commentary about a year afterwards in the execution of Thomas Aikenhead, a medical student, on a charge of blaspheming. In the company of fellow-students he had freely avowed infidel opinions, and said foolish things of the Bible and Christianity. For this he was put on trial under a statute of Charles II., and condemned by the unanimous verdict of the High Court of Justiciary in Edinburgh on the 23rd December 1696. After conviction he became sincerely penitent, recanted his scepticism, and begged for his life. Public sympathy was excited by his youth—he was only eighteen—and efforts were made to procure his pardon, but the ministers as a body "spoke and preached for cutting him off," and the civil authorities were in consequence unable to save him. As a proof of his penitence he carried a Bible with him to the scaffold and died with it in his hands. The execution from every

¹ *Acts Parl. Scot.* ix. 387, 449; *Carstares' State Papers*, p. 263; *Burnet*, iv. 275.

point of view was a disgrace to those who were responsible for it, and none were more so than the Edinburgh ministers. Young Aikenhead was the last to suffer death in Scotland for an offence against the laws of religion.¹

The "Act for settling of Schools," passed by Parliament in this year (1696), had probably something to do with the ultimate disappearance of "witches."² It recalls earlier efforts made from time to time to improve the education of the people. First, the Act of 1496, exactly two hundred years before, when James IV. anticipated compulsory education on a limited scale; next, the legislation of the General Assembly of Aberdeen under archbishop Spottiswoode in 1616, and the legislation of the Scots Parliament of 1633 at the instance of Charles I. By the Act of 1696 the heritors of every parish were required to provide a school with a house and salary for the schoolmaster. It was reserved for the Act of 1872 to put the copestone upon our national system of education, but this provision of 1696 conferred a boon upon the Scottish people of which they fully availed themselves. The peasantry received in the parish schools an elementary education, which in many cases led the way to the more liberal culture of the Universities.³

The Assembly of 1697 framed an Act against hasty legislation, known as the Barrier Act, which is in force at the present day. It provides that before any proposed legislation affecting doctrine, worship, discipline, or government becomes binding upon the Presbyterian Church, it

¹ *State Trials*, xiii. 917-938; Chambers, *Dom. Annals*, iii. 160-166; Burton, viii. 75-77. Macaulay, *Hist. England*, chap. xxii., says of the Edinburgh ministers' conduct to Aikenhead—"Wodrow has told no blacker story of Dundee."

² Burt, *Letter* xii., relates the

condemnation of a mother and daughter for witchcraft in Sutherlandshire in the year 1727. The daughter made her escape from prison, the mother was burned at Dornoch in a pitch-barrel.

³ *Acts of Parl.* William III. sect. vi. chap. 26; Burton, viii. 72, 73.

must first come before the Assembly as an overture, and then be remitted to the several presbyteries for their consideration. If approved by a majority of the presbyteries and adopted by the Assembly it then becomes the law of the Church. The provision well exemplifies the maxim *festina lente*, and is fitted to save such a fluctuating body as the Assembly from legislating in haste and repenting at leisure.¹

In this same year a proposal was made for removing the University of St. Andrews to the town of Perth. Since the fall of the Episcopal hierarchy the ancient city had entered the stage of decline and decay. Ichabod was written over its mediæval gateways, and many reasons, such as the difficulty of access and the dearness of provisions, which were unheard of before, were now assigned for the removal. The Perth citizens welcomed the proposal, and made generous offers for housing the transferred University, but all in vain. The earl of Tullibardine, secretary of State, who was chancellor of the University, and favoured the translation, was removed from political office in June 1698, and Fife was allowed to retain the oldest of our Scottish Universities.²

Another Act of Parliament,—popularly known by the short and significant title, “the Rabbling Act,”—passed in 1698,³ affords evidence of the difficulty still experienced, ten years after the Revolution, in ejecting the Episcopal incumbents from the parish churches. The rabblings of the south-west were reversed in the central and northern districts. In the one district the possessors had been rabbled out of possession, and in the others the new

¹ *Acts of Assembly*, 1697.

² It is a curious coincidence that a bill was drawn in 1884 for the transferring of St. Andrews University, on this occasion not to Perth, but to Dundee.

³ It was entitled “An Act for preventing of Disorders in the Supplying and Planting of Vacant Churches,” *Acts of Parl.* William III. sect. v. chap. 22.

claimants were rabbled from getting into possession. The result was a series of unseemly riots, often in the churchyard and sometimes in the church, between the Presbyterian minister, determined to enter with the law at his back, and the Episcopalian laity equally determined to keep him out. The rioting spread from parish to parish until the Legislature interfered. It offers a suggestive commentary upon the statement in the Claim of Right, that Presbytery was established in accordance with the inclinations of the people.¹

Scotland was overshadowed at this time (1698-1701) by a great mercantile disaster, the collapse of the Darien expedition, which brought many families to poverty and some to ruin. The Assemblies of 1700 and 1701 appointed a fast in each of these years to supplicate God under the national calamity. Much ill-feeling was roused in Scotland against king William and the English people for their share in contributing to the failure of the enterprise. Shields, the Covenanter, was one of four ministers who went as chaplains with the hopeful colonists. Of the many hundreds who crossed the Atlantic few returned to tell the story of their sufferings and loss.²

The questions that had agitated the Church from the Reformation downwards had turned mainly on government and worship, and very little on doctrine. In William's reign the Presbyterian Church was disturbed by the doctrines of a foreign mystic, Antoinette Bourignon. She was born at Lisle in 1616, educated in the Roman faith, and at the age of sixteen separated from her friends to

¹ "The dominant Presbyters, of course, cried out loudly against the obstinacy of the Episcopal ministers in clinging to their manes, and the obstinacy of the Episcopal people in clinging to their ministers; but surely

in this they were not more reasonable than the fish-woman who curses the eel for wriggling while she skins it."

—Cunningham, *Ch. Hist. Scot.* ii. 319.
² *Acts of the Assembly*, pp. 290-305; Burton, viii. 40-59.

devote herself to the religious life. After having been expelled from several countries for unsound teaching she died at Franeker in Friesland in 1680. Many of her ideas were visionary and tinged with the mysticism of the Quietists. She professed to have received by special revelation the true meaning of Holy Scripture, and taught that the religious life was exclusively a matter between the individual soul and the Holy Spirit. She had the pen of a ready writer, and her collected works make no less than twenty-six volumes. Many converts were made to her opinions in Holland, France, and Germany, both before and after they spread into Scotland. Among much that was erroneous in her teaching there was also much that commended itself to men's minds in an age when personal piety and devotion had seriously suffered from the bitterness of ecclesiastical controversy. Several of her works were translated from French into English, and found ready sympathisers in Scotland.¹ Among these was Dr. George Garden, Episcopal minister in Aberdeen, who published in 1699 an *Apology for Madame Antonia Bourignon*. He had been harassed by the General Assembly and its commission, and deprived of his church, St. Nicholas, for nonconformity. As an Episcopal clergyman he had never been subject to the Presbyterian Church, yet the Assembly now summoned him for teaching Bourignonism, tried and condemned him, and deposed him from the ministry. Dr. Garden disregarded the sentence, and continued to minister as formerly to his Episcopal flock in Aberdeen ; but the action of the Assembly shows how lofty was the claim of Presbyterian supremacy. The sentence pronounced on Dr. Garden was based on an entire misconception of the Bourignonian doctrines, and only

¹ *The Renovation of the Gospel Spirit, Solid Virtue, The Light of the World, The Light risen in Darkness.*

showed that his judges had not read Madame Bourignon's works. Ten years afterwards the Assembly included the Bourignian among the other heresies—"Popish, Arian, Socinian, Arminian, Bourignian"—which candidates for ordination had to disclaim. The term was retained in the formula long after the heresy was dead and forgotten, and was only dropped by the Assembly of 1889.¹

The reign of William was drawing to a close. He had the misfortune to be thrown from his horse at the end of February 1702, and his constitution, at no time strong, received a shock from which he never rallied. He died on the 8th March. Eight years before, his wife, Mary, had gone to her rest, and his father-in-law, king James, had died in September 1701. There was no issue of William's marriage, and the succession to the throne, in accordance with the Revolution Settlement, confirmed by the Act of Settlement in 1700, devolved upon Anne and the heirs of her body. The Act accepted the daughter of James and excluded his only son, settled the crown on the Hanoverian branch, and required the sovereign to be always a member of the Church of England.

William never visited Scotland, though preparations were at one time made for his coronation in Holyrood, and lord Stair had expected him to open the Scottish Parliament in 1690. He was the first of a line of absentee sovereigns who, for more than a century, until the royal visit of George IV. in 1822, ruled Scotland without ever setting foot in its territory. The Dutch king was never popular in any of the three kingdoms,

¹ *Acts of the Assembly*, pp. 260, 261, 306-308; Dr. Milroy, Story's ed. *Ch. Scot.* iv. 245-249; Chambers's *Dom. Annals*, iii. 319; Wodrow's *Analecta*, i. 273. See what Dr. Garden says of his deprivation in an address to the English prelates and clergy

prefixed to works of Dr. John Forbes.

The statutes provided for the R. C. Scottish Mission under bishop Nicolson in the year 1700 warned the faithful against the errors of the Bourignonites—Bellesheim, iv. 169, 200.

being too cold and phlegmatic in temperament to court or to care for popularity with his subjects. He was nevertheless a judicious and capable administrator of the realm; and while Presbyterians have every reason to revere his memory for the establishment of their religion, Episcopalians have to remember that it was not William, but the Scottish bishops and the Jacobite laity who virtually disestablished Episcopacy; and that William, instead of retaliating on the non-juring clergy for repudiating his authority, repeatedly sheltered them from persecution and endeavoured to accommodate them in the new Establishment. That so many refused the accommodation was honourable to them; that the king, a Dutch Presbyterian, made the offer of it was none the less creditable to him, even though he did so as a matter of State policy.¹

¹ The private life of king William was not free from reproach, though a policy of silence has been observed by Whig historians. The dissoluteness of Charles II. and his court has become matter of public notoriety. Dean Plumtre, in his *Life of Bishop Ken*, ii. 21, remarks—"The morals of the court of the Hague were not one whit better than those of the

court of Whitehall under Charles II. There also was the reign of harlots." William's later life at Kensington palace, and especially his treatment of his wife, was not irreproachable. See Plumtre, i. 143, 144; and ii. 79, note. Dr. Ken, before he was bishop, was chaplain to Mary at the Hague.

CHAPTER XXI

QUEEN ANNE, 1702-1714

Act of Settlement—Politics of Episcopal clergy—Rabbling of Episcopal clergy—Their petitions to the queen—Higher claims by Assembly of 1703—Scottish Parliament, 1703—Intolerance of Assembly's Commission—Death of archbishop Ross, the last primate, 1704—Deference of bishops to royal prerogative—Consecration of bishops—Bishop Sage—Treaty of Union, 1707—Terms of Treaty—Carstares and the Union—Bishops Campbell and Gadderar—The Assembly on public worship, psalmody, and penny weddings—Episcopalians use English Prayer Book—Opposition of Presbyterians to its use—Greenshields' case—Rabbling of Presbyterian ministers—Rabbling of Episcopal ministers—Toleration Act, 1712—Presbyterians oppose toleration—History of patronage—Patronage Act, 1712—Christmas vacation Act for Law Courts—Abjuration Oath—Jurants and non-jurants—Public protestation of "M'Millanites"—Assembly of 1714 memorialise the queen on popery and prelacy—Death of queen Anne—Chief events of her reign.

ANNE became queen, under the Act of Settlement, on 8th March 1702. Her accession pleased both political sections. The "Constitutionalists" were gratified that she was queen under the new Settlement, and the Jacobites professed equal satisfaction that she was a Stuart. An amiable and devout woman, but without force of character, she fell entirely under the power of favourites by whom the country was ruled in her name. Her devotion to the Church of England was well known, and made the Presbyterians as uneasy as it made the Episcopalians hopeful. Anne married prince George of Denmark, who

never had any influence in the country, and she had the misfortune to lose all her children in infancy, except the duke of Gloucester, who died at the age of eleven, in 1700. His death led to the Act of Settlement, and opened the way to Jacobite intrigue, which became active towards the close of Anne's reign.

During the eighteenth century ecclesiastical affairs have less national importance than they had from the Reformation to the Revolution. Then the Church, often more political than religious, was a potent factor in the settlement of national affairs; now she sinks into a subordinate place, and her history is correspondingly bare of stirring events. The removal of the Scottish Parliament and Privy Council in this reign, instead of strengthening the influence of the General Assembly by leaving it single and supreme in the field, really stripped it of the adventitious importance which the immediate proximity of Parliament and Council had once conferred upon it. Scottish nobles and gentry no longer gravitated to Edinburgh but to London; so that not only the political, but in a measure the ecclesiastical, centre was shifted southward. The Assembly busied itself from year to year with the internal affairs of the Presbyterian Church, and none challenged its decisions save those who successively seceded from the Establishment upon grounds of doctrine or discipline, or the irrepressible grievance of Church patronage. Episcopacy became more deeply entangled in the politics of the day—became Jacobite indeed as much as Episcopal. Penal laws and persecutions were the consequence, and after a century's wandering in the wilderness, when she had paid the full price for putting her trust in princes, the remanent Church emerged "the shadow of a shade."

Political causes divided the Episcopal clergy in queen

Anne's reign into three classes : first, the bishops and the non-juring clergy who adhered to them, refusing the oaths ; secondly, those who kept possession of their parishes and were recognised by the presbyteries, but not admitted to their courts ; thirdly, those who kept possession in defiance of, or at least in armed neutrality towards, the presbytery. The bishops and their non-juring clergy continued their ministrations as best they could, at the risk of being mobbed and rabbled. In January 1702 their meeting-house in Glasgow was attacked during worship, and again in March with still more violence ; although the chief promoter of the service, Sir John Bell, had been formerly a benevolent and popular magistrate of the city.¹ The same thing happened at St. Andrews, Aberdeen, Edinburgh, and other places.² The Episcopal clergy, aware of the queen's sympathy, presented an "Humble Address and Supplication" to her majesty, in which they referred to "the deplorable condition of the once national Church since the suppression of its ancient Apostolic government, and the disgrace brought on a Christian land wherein those who had been ordained for the service of Christ at the altar were driven forth as wanderers to beg their bread." The queen sent a gracious answer, and she also wrote to the Scots Privy Council on their behalf, recommending that while they observed the laws, they should be protected in the peaceable exercise of their religion.³

The Assembly met under lord Seafield as commissioner on 10th March 1703. In reply to the queen's

¹ In Cleland's *Annals of Glasgow*, i. 139, it is said that "the Scottish Episcopalians were the first religious body, not connected with the Church of Scotland, who regularly met for worship after the Revolution."

² Chambers's *Dom. Annals*, iii. 273, 274 ; Lawson, pp. 180, 202.

³ Another address was presented

to the queen next year, 1703, by Dr. Scott and Dr. Skene, the former being the deprived dean of Glasgow and rector of Hamilton. They were introduced by the duke of Queensberry and lord Tarbet. Skinner, ii. 601 ; Thos. Stephen, iii. 641, 642 ; Lawson, pp. 177, 178 ; Burton, viii. 90.

letter, which spoke of the Presbyterian government "as that which we find acceptable to the inclinations of our people, and established by the laws of the kingdom,"—which was the position assumed in the Claim of Right,—the Assembly now took higher ground, and informed her majesty that Presbytery was agreeable to the Word of God and the only government of Christ's Church in the kingdom. This was the claim of the Covenanting section at the Revolution, which the Parliament rejected on establishing Presbytery. Forgetting their own line of conduct, not twenty years before, the ministers complained in their address to the queen that the Episcopal clergy were violating the laws of the land by "baptizing, preaching, marrying, intruding into vacant churches, and despising sentences of deprivation." The Episcopalians were only doing in the face of repressive laws what Presbyterians had done for thirty years in similar circumstances. When times change, men are apt to change with them. The Assembly was about to embody in an Act their high-flying claims of Presbytery, when the commissioner interfered and abruptly dissolved the meeting.¹

The last of the Scottish Parliaments was opened on 6th May 1703. The earl of Strathmore, thinking the time propitious, introduced a bill of toleration for all protestant dissenters from the established Church, with a special view to members of the disestablished Church. The commission of the Assembly opposed it by a remonstrance in which they said—"We do, therefore, most humbly beseech, yea, we are bold in the Lord, and in the name of the Church of God in this land, earnestly to obtest your grace (the duke of Queensberry) and the most honourable Estates that no such motion of any legal toleration to those of the prelatical principles be enter-

¹ *Acts of Assembly*, pp. 316-321 ; Thos. Stephen, iii. 646.

tained by the Parliament ; being persuaded that in the present case and circumstances of this Church and nation, to enact a toleration for those of that way (which God of His infinite mercy avert) would be to establish iniquity by a law, and would bring upon the promoters thereof, and upon their families, the dreadful guilt of all those sins, and pernicious effects both to Church and State, that may ensue thereupon."¹ Substitute covenanting for prelatical in this address, and it might have emanated from the Privy Council under Lauderdale. The duke of Queensberry was anxious to gain the Presbyterian vote on other questions of national interest, and nothing more was heard of the Bill. The vision of toleration was for an appointed time, but that time was not yet.

Archbishop Ross, the primate, died in 1704, and with him died the primatial and metropolitan jurisdiction exercised under the Episcopal hierarchy. As a matter of fact it has never been restored. The bishops made no appointment to the primatial see, partly in order not to offend the government by claiming the old territorial titles, and partly from a less satisfactory motive, not to appoint to the primacy without the concurrence of the hereditary heir to the throne, the Chevalier St. George, whom the Jacobites recognised as James the Eighth. Their titular king over the water was at this time a mere stripling, but neither his youth, nor the fact that the prince was, as his father had been, of another faith, was allowed to affect their deference to the royal prerogative in the appointing of bishops—a deference which had been so detrimental to the Church in years gone by. It was necessary, however, to add to the number of bishops, as only five of them remained, and one, the bishop of Moray,

¹ *Acts Parl. Scot.* xi. 46, 47; Burton, viii. 90; Thos. Stephen, iii. 640-650; Lockhart, *Papers*, i. 66.

was an invalid. It was therefore arranged to consecrate suitable persons to the Episcopal office without assigning to them any diocese, and without admitting them to any share in the government of the Church. That was still to remain in the hands of the few disestablished bishops. The arrangement could only be provisional, and it introduced an unconstitutional complication into the affairs of the Church by the recognition of two classes of bishops—ruling and non-ruling.

In accordance with this resolution two presbyters, Sage and Fullarton, were, after consultation with the leading laity and clergy, chosen for the Episcopal office, and consecrated in Edinburgh on 25th January 1705, in the house of archbishop Paterson. Sage had been a minister in Glasgow, and Fullarton in Paisley, before the rabbling at the Revolution. Both men were qualified for the Episcopate by personal worth, and Sage was no mean scholar, continuing the traditions of Leighton, the Scougals, and the three Forbeses, who had shed lustre upon the Church by their learning. His scholarly reputation procured him in 1688 a nomination to the chair of divinity in St. Andrews, which the Revolution prevented him from occupying.¹

The matter of engrossing concern in Scotland at this time was the proposed legislative union with England; for although both nations had been under one crown for more than a century they still continued separate kingdoms,

¹ Gillan, in his *Life of Sage*, published in 1714, says, p. 69—"He defended the Church strenuously and learnedly with his pen in its low condition, and was fit to have governed it in its highest post, if it had pleased God to restore it to peace and tranquillity." Besides many pamphlets he was the author of the *Principles of the Cyprianic Age* and the *Fundamental Charter of Presbytery*. Be-

fore his consecration he was a confessor as well as a defender of his faith, being banished from Edinburgh by the Privy Council, and then threatened with imprisonment, which he only escaped by taking refuge in the hills of Angus.—Keith's *Catalogue*, pp. 518-521; Skinner, ii. 602, 603; *Life of Sage*, Preface to Spott. Soc. ed. of his Works.

each with its own Parliament and Executive, independent of the other. William III. had early seen the disadvantage of separate legislatures, and had sought to unite and consolidate the political power of Britain in order to strengthen it both against internal dissension and foreign aggression. Continental wars diverted his attention from the subject, and the settlement was left for his successor. In 1702 negotiations were opened and failed; they were resumed in 1705, and in the following year thirty commissioners from each kingdom met at Westminster. Popular feeling in Scotland was almost unanimous against the Union. The Jacobites opposed it because they foresaw that it would lessen the chances of their success, and the recall of their prince. The Presbyterians opposed it from dread of the ecclesiastical ascendancy of England through any closer connection with that prelatial country; and the remanent Cameronians were actuated by a similar objection to an "uncovenanted" sovereign. The common people had their minds imbued with the vague terror that Scotland was to be shamefully robbed of the national independence which had cost their fathers so dear. Petitions from presbyteries, counties, and burghs were presented to the Scots Parliament against the Treaty. No men were more unpopular in Scotland during this ferment than the statesmen known to be favourable to the cause of union.¹

One man had juster views of the situation—William Carstares. Since the death of his friend and patron, king William, he had become principal of Edinburgh University, and continued to exercise all his old influence over the Presbyterian Church.² By his counsels the Assembly was satisfied with the protection of the Presbyterian Church

¹ Somerville's *History of Queen Anne's Reign*, pp. 207-232; Burton, viii. 81-165 *passim*.

² Carstares became principal in

May 1703, on the death of Gilbert Rule.—Dalziel's *Hist. Univ. Edinburgh*, ii. 184.

under the Treaty. Parliament passed an Act for securing the Protestant religion and Presbyterian Church government in Scotland, and it was provided that this Act should be incorporated in the Treaty. When it was known that a similar security was to be given to the Church of England, there was an ebullition of the old covenanting spirit. A petition was presented by the Assembly's commission, demanding that no pledge should be given for the maintenance of a prelatic hierarchy in England, as that would involve the nation in guilt.¹

The Union was ratified by the Scots Parliament on 16th January 1707, and received the royal assent on the 6th March. On the 25th, Lady Day, the old Scots Parliament adjourned to meet no more. Lord Seafeld, the chancellor, on moving the adjournment, is said to have remarked—"There's the end of an auld sang." On the 1st of May, when the Act came into operation, there was a national thanksgiving in St. Paul's cathedral, attended by the queen and many members of both Houses of Parliament. But while Englishmen were singing *Te Deums* by the Thames, Scotsmen at home were lamenting that the glory of their country had departed.²

While the Roman Catholics continued to be the objects of royal proclamations and persecutions,³ James

¹ De Foe's *Hist. of Union*, pp. 480, 625. The Act also required that the principals, professors, and masters in any Scottish University, college, or school, should subscribe the Confession of Faith, and submit to the government of the Presbyterian Church (*Acts of Parl. Scot.* xi. 402-414). The portion of the Act demanding subscription to the Confession, etc., on the part of professors and teachers, was modified in 1853. Only professors of Theology are now required to subscribe the Confession of Faith.

² *Memoirs of Sir John Clerk of Penicuik*, Scot. Hist. Soc. pp. 57-68; Carstares's *State Papers*, pp. 759, 760. In Calamy's *Historical Account of his own Life*, ii. 44, he says—"The English Dissenters were very much for this Union, as the most effectual way for securing the Protestant succession, and even the continuance of their ecclesiastical establishment in North Britain."

³ Queen Anne's Proclamation of March 1704 against the papists. See also *Miscellany of Mailland Club*, iii. 392.

Gordon, of the Scots College, Paris, was consecrated at Montefiascone in 1706 as coadjutor to bishop Nicolson in Scotland. In the following year he visited the Highlands and Islands, accompanied by a Gaelic-speaking deacon as his interpreter, and during his visitation confirmed nearly three thousand persons.¹

The Episcopal Church continued its succession by several consecrations during this reign. The deaths of bishop Hay in 1707, and of archbishop Paterson in 1708, had again reduced the number of bishops to five. On the 28th April 1709, John Falconer, the deprived minister of Carnbee in Fife, and Henry Christie, the friend of Sage, were consecrated at Dundee. Bishop Sage died in 1711,² and in the same year Archibald Campbell was consecrated at Dundee. The new bishop was grandson of the Covenanting marquis of Argyll, and had a somewhat eventful history. Involved in the insurrection of his uncle, the earl of Argyll, he was imprisoned and afterwards exiled. On his return he was more than once apprehended, and from being "a violent Whig," he afterwards, according to Dr. Johnson, "kept better company, and became a Tory." His religious opinions underwent a similar change, and he was now as zealous for Episcopacy as for king James. After his consecration he continued to live chiefly in London, and his services were of little direct benefit to the northern Church.³ The next consecration was that of James Gadderar at London in 1712. He had been rector of Kilmalcolm on the Clyde, and after the Revolution resided in England, where he made the friendship of bishop Campbell. His

¹ The deacon was ordained to the priesthood at Scothouse, in Knoydart, and the ordination is noteworthy as being the first R.C. ordination in Scotland since the Reformation.—

Bellesheim, iv. 180, note.

² Gillan's *Life of Sage*, pp. 67, 68.

³ Lawson, pp. 211, 212; Boswell's *Journal of Tour to Hebrides*, p. 284.

consecrators were bishop Hickea, the English non-juror, and the two Scottish bishops, Falconer and Campbell.¹

In March 1708 Scotland was scared by the appearance of a French fleet off Montrose, which was supposed to have in view the restoration of the exiled dynasty. Admiral Byng sailed north in pursuit, and nothing more was heard of the threatened invasion. The Presbyterians had proclaimed a fast, and redoubled their severities against the Episcopal clergy, who were suspected of having invited the Frenchmen. On the 17th April, when the Assembly met under Carstares, moderator for the second time, the queen thanked them for their loyalty, and the Assembly replied that "they had an equal detestation of the counsels of Versailles and the pretensions of St. Germaines."²

The Assembly now turned its attention to the improvement of public worship and the morals of the people. Episcopacy had done little during its last establishment to train the people in habits of reverent worship, and matters had not improved under twenty years of Presbytery. In the year 1709³ the Assembly passed an Act with the significant title: "Concerning people's behaviour in time of divine worship." Church-goers were enjoined to "forbear bowing and other expressions of civil respect, and entertaining one another with discourses, while divine worship was performing."⁴ The men, to show their superiority to "superstition," entered the church "bonneted," and the minister remained covered until he got into the pulpit.

¹ This is the only instance of an English non-juring bishop assisting in the consecration of a Scottish prelate.—Grub, iii. 357, 358; Keith's *Catalogue*, p. 531.

² *Acts of Assembly*, p. 423.

³ Calamy visited the Assembly in this year, and listened to its debates.

"That which he took to be most remarkable was," he says, "that not one in all the General Assembly was for the Divine right of the Presbyterian form of Church government, though they submitted to it."—Calamy's *Hist. Account*, ii. 152 seq.

⁴ *Acts of Assembly*, p. 432.

The congregation sat in the time of prayer, and every man "clapped on his bonnet during the sermon."¹ With the same object an Act was passed to improve the psalmody of the Church, recommending presbyteries to select schoolmasters capable of teaching the people the common psalm tunes. The old "sang - schules" of the mediæval Church had been revived in the sixteenth century, but the troubles of the Covenanting struggle and the spirit of Puritanism strangled the art of sacred music for several generations. As a consequence, public worship in Scotland was now more bald and uncouth than in any other country of Christendom.² Penny weddings also came under the Assembly's legislation. In 1701 it had condemned them, and in 1706 it enjoined the presbyteries to call upon the magistrates to enforce the laws passed in the reign of Charles II. against these promiscuous gatherings, in which delicacy and decency were alike discarded.³

After the Treaty of Union, the Episcopal clergy became bolder in the use of the English Liturgy in their chapels, and in churchyards on the burial of the dead. They had the sympathy of the queen and of a large body in the English Church, who thought it anomalous and unjust that the Prayer Book so dear to them, and sanctioned by their legislature, should be virtually proscribed

¹ Sage's *Fundamental Charter of Presbytery*, p. 362. The curious will find this subject humorously treated in the pamphlet, "Presbyterian Eloquence Displayed," attributed to "Curate" Calder, and in the rejoinders of John Anderson, minister of Dunbarton. See also "The Case of the present Afflicted Clergy in Scotland" (London, 1690), where it is said of public worship at the Revolution: "As to worship, it is exactly the same both in the church

and conventicle. In the church there are no ceremonies at all enjoined or practised, only some persons more reverent think fit to be uncovered, which our Presbyterians do but by halves even in the time of prayer."

² See Dr. R. Lee's *Reform of Ch. Scot.* p. 118; and Cunningham, ii. 341; *Acts of Assembly for 1713*, p. 483.

³ See *Acts of Assembly for years* quoted; and Burt's *Letters*, i. 261.

in the northern part of the kingdom. The arrival of English officials attached to the civil service, and of English regiments in Scotland, strengthened the hands of the Episcopalians. English clergymen followed their countrymen, and publicly used their Liturgy; and Prayer Books to the number of nineteen thousand, gifted by zealous sympathisers in the south, were distributed throughout Scotland.¹ It was the most peaceful invasion that had crossed the borders for a hundred years, since the introduction of the English Bible in 1611. This was not the light, however, in which it was regarded by the General Assembly. As soon as they were aware of the use of the Prayer Book, they became zealously affected for "the purity of religion, and particularly of divine worship and uniformity therein." In 1707 they passed an "Act against Innovations in the Worship of God," not aimed at innovators in the Presbyterian Church, with whom they were entitled to deal, but at Episcopal clergy and their congregations, over whom they had no authority. The Act goes on to say—"We do instruct and enjoin the commission of this Assembly to use all proper means, by applying to the government or otherwise, for suppressing and removing all such innovations, and preventing the evils and dangers that may ensue thereupon to this Church."² The proposed application to the government to put down the use of the Prayer Book by force was another adaptation of Lauderdale's policy, and shows how ready the Presbyterians were when they got the

¹ Lathbury's *Non-jurors*, p. 466. So popular had Liturgies now become among a certain class in Scotland, that a new edition of "Laud's Liturgy" was published at this time with the imprimatur—"Edinburgh: Printed by James Watson, and sold at his shop opposite the Lucken Booth, 1712." It was printed at the expense of the

Earl of Winton. See Burton, viii. 220; and *New Stat. Account*, Kincardineshire, Oct. 12th and 19th, 1712.

² *Acts of Assembly*, pp. 418, 419. See also Sermon preached at synod of Moray, 1708-9, by James Thomson of Established Church.

upper hand to practise the same intolerance against which they had rebelled when they were the victims.

The limits of the Assembly's jurisdiction were soon afterwards tested by the case of James Greenshields. He was the son of a Scottish clergyman deprived at the Revolution, and had himself received orders from Ramsay, the deposed bishop of Ross. After thirteen years' service in the dioceses of Down and Armagh, he came to Edinburgh in 1709, bringing with him favourable credentials from the Irish bishops. He had also taken the oaths to the government, and was thus in the eye of the law qualified to minister. At the request of some Edinburgh citizens he opened a place of worship, in which the English Prayer Book was used. The local presbytery thereupon summoned him before them. He appeared, but disclaimed their authority. They answered by prohibiting him from preaching on the grounds that he declined their jurisdiction, ministered without their authority, and introduced innovations in public worship. Application was made to the magistrates to enforce their sentence, and they forbade Greenshields to preach under pain of imprisonment. Next Sunday he officiated as usual, and was in consequence lodged in the common jail. A bill of suspension was presented to the Court of Session, wherein it was pleaded that both the presbytery and the magistrates had acted without warrant of law, and that Greenshields was entitled to the same liberty in Scotland that Scottish Presbyterians had in Ireland, where, though they had no legal toleration, they enjoyed entire freedom of worship. The lords of Session refused the Bill, chiefly on the ground that the petitioner, having been ordained by an "exauctorated" (deprived) bishop, had no valid ordination. One of the judges in deciding the case, said "an exauctorated bishop had no more power to ordain a minister than a deposed

colonel or captain of horse had to give commissions to subalterns"; and another judge, capping the illustration, remarked that such a bishop "had no more power to ordain than a ballad-crier on the streets."

It was a victory for the Presbyterians, but at the cost of their own principles. The bishops had been deprived by Act of Parliament, not by sentence of any ecclesiastical court; and Acts of Parliament are not generally supposed to cancel, any more than they confer, spiritual authority to minister in the Church of Christ. The Presbyterian ministers had been "exauctorated" at the Restoration, and nothing is better known than their public defiance of the law that deposed them and forbade their ministry except within the lines of the Episcopal Establishment. And yet they officiated despite Acts of Parliament, and set the west of Scotland in a blaze. If they were right then, the Episcopal clergy were not wrong now, not even such of them as refused the oath, for Cameron, Cargill, Renwick, and all the pronounced Covenanters, had not only abjured the king's sovereignty, but publicly excommunicated his majesty.

Despite the fate of Greenshields, many clergymen were emboldened to use the liturgy in public. At Brechin the deposed clergyman, accompanied by many of the local gentry, took possession of the church, and kept out the Presbyterian minister, who was mobbed and pelted by the crowd.¹ Scenes of this kind, of which there were several, naturally provoked the Presbyterians to retaliate. They denounced from the pulpit the Anglican Church and its liturgy, attempted to stop the use of the Prayer Book by English chaplains of English regiments stationed in Scotland, and carried their complaints before the lord advocate. English officers were at a loss to account for an intolerance such as they had not experi-

¹ Wodrow's *Correspondence*, i. 79, 80.

enced even in Roman Catholic countries.¹ The Assembly's commission, August 1709, supported the action of the Edinburgh presbytery against Greenshields, and passed a stringent order "obtesting all in the bowels of the Lord Jesus Christ to avoid and discountenance all innovations in the worship of God."²

Greenshields and his friends appealed to the British House of Peers, upon which the Edinburgh magistrates released him after an imprisonment of seven months. No appellate jurisdiction had been assigned in the Treaty of Union to the House of Lords, and the appeal took Scotland by surprise.³ While the case was still pending a new Parliament was elected: the Whigs went out of office, and a Tory ministry under Harley, afterwards earl of Oxford, succeeded. The change was all in Greenshields' favour; for while it is doubtful whether even the Whigs would have forbidden the use of the Prayer Book in Scotland, the high church Tories were certain to approve of it. The premier, from politic reasons, endeavoured to persuade Lockhart of Carnwath, the most active and influential agent of the Scottish Jacobites, to have the appeal withdrawn, but he declined to interfere. The decision of the Lords was not pronounced until March 1711. It reversed the decree of the Court of Session, and found the magistrates of Edinburgh liable in costs. The Episcopalians were as much elated as the Presbyterians were dispirited by the decision. The whole case, petty and even contemptible as it now appears, is a

¹ One of them writing from Edinburgh to a friend in London, remarks: "I have seen so much violence and inveteracy from the Presbyterian party here against the Church of England in particular and the nation in general, that it almost turns my stomach, and if anything makes me a highflyer, it will be the unreasonable bitter invective

and prodigious imprecations which I have, with my own ears, heard from some too zealous Presbyterian clergy in their pulpits here against the Church of England."—Carstares' *State Papers*, pp. 783, 784.

² McCormick's *Life of Carstares*, p. 79, and Carstares' *State Papers*, p. 773.

³ Burton, viii. 222.

forcible illustration of how far and how happily the nation has since travelled in the path of religious toleration.¹

Several riots at the induction of Presbyterian ministers were reported to the Assembly of 1711. The minister of Gairloch, in Ross-shire, was seized on the confines of a parish where he was about to preach by a body of armed men, who confined him in a cattle-shed for four days. He was brought before Sir John MacKenzie of Coul, who warned him that no Presbyterian minister should be tolerated in that quarter, unless he was imposed upon them by military force. At Old Deer both presbytery and presentee were stoned by the people. The presentee's friends, some forty in number, provided with arms, had accompanied him from Aberdeen, and upon being assaulted they fired upon the people and wounded several. "Unless there had been a seasonable interposition," says Wodrow, "there would have been bloody work; but the presbytery retired." At Aberlemno, Forfarshire, the parishioners boycotted the new minister for a couple of years. Neither man, woman, nor child would speak to him, and he was fain to entreat the presbytery to find him another parish.²

The Episcopalians were not always the aggressors in the frays of the time. Encouraged by the success of Mr. Greenshields they ventured in many places to introduce the Prayer Book. Presbyteries took offence, though the ministers were mostly outside of their judicatories, and deposed them as "innovators." Mr. Honeyman, of Crail,

¹ For the Greenshields' case see, besides references cited, Lockhart, *Papers*, i. 345-348; Wodrow, *Correspondence*, i. 68, 69; Lathbury's *History of the Non-jurors*, pp. 450-454; Thomas Stephen, iv. 34-50, 59-61; Lawson, pp. 194-196; *The True State of the Case of Rev. Mr.*

Greenshields, now Prisoner in Tolbooth of Edinburgh, printed at London in 1710; Somerville's *History of Queen Anne*, p. 469; Chambers, *Dom. Annals*, iii. 350; Fountainhall's *Decisions*, ii. 524.

² Wodrow, *Correspondence*, i. 216, 217, and *Analecta*, ii. 187.

was "prosecuted and deposed by the presbytery, and if the magistrates and people had not been Episcopal he would have fallen under very severe punishments." At Aberdeen Mr. Dunbreck was libelled by the presbytery, prosecuted by the magistrates, and threatened by the lord advocate, for using the English liturgy in the earl Marischal's own house, to whom he was chaplain. The earl of Carnwath, in the summer of 1711, was threatened "to have his house burned over his head if he continued the English service in it, and the chaplain thereafter forced to leave his family." In November the presbytery of Perth deposed Henry Murray, a pre-revolution incumbent of Perth, hitherto undisturbed, for using the liturgy in church, and at baptisms and burials.¹ At Auchterarder, famous as the scene of ecclesiastical strife, "the common people, though not very Presbyterian in their principles," as Wodrow remarks, prevented the service from being used at a funeral, and "chased off the liturgy-man" despite the intervention of lord Rollo, a local justice of peace.²

Cases of this kind, following upon that of Greenshields, induced the Episcopalians to seek legal toleration for their worship from the Tory administration. A Bill was introduced into the House of Commons, 21st January 1712, "to prevent the disturbance of the Episcopal Communion in Scotland in the exercise of their religious worship and in the use of the Liturgy of the Church of England; and for repealing an Act of the Scottish Parliament, entitled an Act against Irregular Baptisms and Marriages." The commission of the Assembly were alarmed at the idea of toleration, and despatched three leading men, Carstares, Blackwell, and Baillie, to oppose the measure. They used their best endeavours with members of Parliament, but

¹ Brochure of two pages, *Miscellany Papers*, Adv. Lib., cited by Chambers,

Dom. Annals, iii. 366.

² Chambers, *Dom. Annals*, iii. 367.

the Bill was carried by an overwhelming majority in both houses, and on the 3rd March received the royal assent.¹ It was declared in the Bill to be "free and lawful for all those of the Episcopal Communion in Scotland to meet for divine worship, to be performed after their own manner by pastors ordained by a Protestant bishop, and who are not established ministers of any church or parish, and to use in their congregations the Liturgy of the Church of England without let, hindrance, or disturbance from any person whatever." The Scottish Act of 1695 against irregular baptisms and marriages, which subjected Episcopal clergymen to imprisonment and exile for baptizing or marrying their own people, was repealed at the same time.

A clause was introduced into the Act which compelled both Presbyterian and Episcopalian ministers to subscribe the oaths of Allegiance and Abjuration, to pray during divine service for queen Anne and the princess Sophia of Hanover, under a penalty of £20. This clause was objectionable to both parties. The Presbyterians resented the dictation of the State in prescribing their prayers, and all the more that by the Act to which they were referred the Sovereign was bound to be a member of the Church of England. The Episcopalians opposed the abjuration oath from Jacobite principles. It is said that the Whigs proposed this clause to hamper the Episcopalians, and that the Tories then manipulated it to make it equally offensive to the Presbyterians.

In the reign of William III. an Act had been passed depriving the Church's excommunications and censures of

¹ Only seventeen members in the House of Commons voted against the Bill, and of these fourteen were Scotsmen. Among the few Whig dissentients in the Upper House was

bishop Burnet, who had been almost singular among Scottish incumbents after the Restoration in using the same Liturgy in the parish church of Saltoun.

all civil effect. In this Bill of 1712 was a clause of similar purport, by which nonconformists were exempted altogether from the jurisdiction and discipline of the Established Church. Carstares was strongly opposed to this provision of the Bill as being detrimental, he said, to the morals of the country; and Lockhart, who was a member of Parliament and active in the interests of the Episcopalians, expressed sympathy with the view, at the same time telling Carstares that his secret reason for opposing it was the dread lest Presbyterians, harassed by Church censures, should seek refuge in the Episcopal fold. With slight alterations the clause was passed. It is instructive to reflect that this battle against religious liberty and toleration was fought by the Established Church in 1712. The Assembly's commission used fasts and prayers and addresses, and even spoke of reviving the Solemn League and Covenant, in opposition to the measure; but it was all in vain.¹

Ten days after the passing of the Toleration Act, a

¹ *Acts of Assembly*, pp. 467-470; Lockhart, *Papers*, i. 378-385; Burton, viii. 223-228; Lawson, 204; Chambers, *Dom. Ann.* iii. 367, 368; Somerville, parish minister of Jedburgh at the close of the eighteenth century (*History of Queen Anne*, pp. 469-472), remarks on the effect of the Act, "The legal toleration of Episcopacy in Scotland, though it restrained acts of violence, rather tended to inflame than to extinguish that spirit of rancour and persecution which the Presbyterians had too often indulged against the Protestants who differed from them. The clergy, dreading the increasing progress of Episcopacy from the patronage of the court, and the openness with which it was now professed in every part of the country, nourished the deluded zeal of their hearers by declaiming against the heresies of that

sect, and recommending the favourite peculiarities of their own establishment rather than the simple and practical truths of the gospel." De Foe, the champion of religious freedom in England, argued against the like toleration in Scotland, because "her Church privileges cannot be invaded by a toleration without destroying the civil as well as the ecclesiastical constitution."—*History of the Union*, pp. 28-31, ed. 1786. Dr. John Brown of Haddington, the most popular nonconformist divine in Scotland, published at Glasgow in 1780 a laborious dissertation on "the Absurdity and Perfidy of all authoritative Tolerations." In the Larger Catechism (question 109), agreed upon by the Westminster Assembly in 1648, toleration figures as a sin forbidden by the Decalogue.

Bill was brought into the House of Commons for the restoration of patronage in the Established Church. This has been a vexed question in Scotland for three hundred years. In the earliest times the landowners, by whom the churches were built and endowed, naturally became the patrons. In some cases the rights of patrons remained with their legal successors ; in others, they were transferred to the bishops, to cathedrals, or to monasteries, or they became invested in the Crown. In the First Book of Discipline it was asserted that "it appertained unto the people and to every several congregation to elect their minister"; but the book never had the sanction of law, and the Parliament of 1567, under the regent Moray, declared that "the presentation of laic patronages was reserved to the just and ancient patrons." On the first establishment of Presbytery under Melville in 1592, it was provided by Act of Parliament that "the presbyteries shall be bound and astricted to receive and admit whatsoever qualified minister is presented by his majesty or laic patrons." On the re-establishment of Episcopacy in 1610, patrons were instructed to make their presentations to the bishop instead of to the presbytery. In the year 1649, under the Covenants, patronages were abolished by statute, and the General Assembly enacted that the kirk-session of each congregation should elect the minister, with an appeal to the presbytery in case of dispute. The Rescissory Act at the Restoration once more restored the rights of patronage to the ancient patrons ; and again, in 1690, William III. reluctantly conceded the power of presentation to the heritors and elders of the parish, the patrons receiving a small pecuniary compensation from the parishes for the loss of their patronage.¹

¹ Only four parishes, Old and New Monkland, Calder, and Strathblane, took advantage of this Act.

Thus the matter stood until the Legislature in 1712 restored the right of presentation to the laic patrons. The people, if they objected to the presentee, were required to state their reasons to the presbytery, with whom, as under the Act of 1690, lay the final decision. Carstares and his brethren presented a petition to the House of Peers against the Bill, in which they maintained that the restoration of patronage was inconsistent with the Treaty of Union. Their petition was at first rejected on the ground of informality, and it was even proposed by the Peers that the petitioners should be taken into custody for contempt. They had addressed it to "the most honourable the Peers of Great Britain," intentionally ignoring the lords spiritual in the Upper House. The commission of the Assembly petitioned the queen against the Bill; five of the bishops voted against it, but it was carried by a large majority, and received the royal assent on the 22nd May 1712.¹

The Presbyterians had better reason for their opposition to patronage than for their opposition to the Toleration Act. It was plausibly argued that by restoring patronage to the Scots nobility and gentry their support would be secured to the Established Church. The Presbyterians had no faith in the argument. The patrons were in many cases Episcopalians, and it was not unnaturally suspected that the presentees would have the ecclesiastical colour of the patrons. The Act has been fruitful of contention, but not from the source which was feared—the Episcopal proclivities of the presentees. It has been the real or ostensible cause of numerous secessions down to the memorable disruption of 1843.

¹ See *Acts of Assembly*, pp. 470, 471; *Parl. Hist. England*, vi. 1126-1129; Wodrow, *Correspondence*, i. 275; Blackwell's *Letters, Miscellany*

of Spalding Club, i. 197-222; Somerville's *History*, p. 472; Burton, viii. 229-232.

Patronage will trouble the Presbyterian Church no more. The Act was finally repealed in 1874, and the right of appointing the minister entrusted to the communicants and adherents of each congregation in the Established Church, subject to such regulations as the Assembly may from time to time impose.

Another Act of this year, significant of the trend of ecclesiastical legislation, repealed the Act of 1690, which had abolished the Christmas vacation of the courts of justice lest it should seem to encourage popish superstition in the observance of the Christian festival. So lords of Session and lawyers had respite again from lawsuits, with liberty to keep "a merry Christmas."¹

The abjuration oath of the Toleration Act had still to be taken by ministers, both Presbyterian and Episcopal. The former met in a general conference, which was attended by members of the Assembly and many other ministers and licentiates. Wodrow, who was present, says that there was "the greatest number of ministers ever met in Scotland, for what I know."² The majority decided in favour of the oath. In the religious cant of the day they "had got clearness." Those who were not clear—the representatives of the Covenanting school—wished their brethren who "had clearness" to delay decision for the sake of unity. They would not delay, and the non-jurants were left in a small minority, who came to be known by the shortened name of "Nons."³ Some of the Episcopal clergy still in possession of parishes qualified by taking the oath; others who had been deprived did the same, and were thus protected in the use of the English Prayer Book. The majority of them continued violent

¹ This Act was again repealed in the next reign.

² *Analecta*, ii. 39.

³ The term "Nons," meaning

non-intrusionists, was applied very commonly in Scotland to members of the Free Church after 1843

Jacobites and declined the oath as a matter of conscience. They went afterwards by the name of Non-jurors.

The Presbyterian non-jurants became every day fewer as they continued to "get clearness," and the government was wisely tolerant towards those who scrupled to take the oath. But there was a stubborn minority, who not only objected to the oath, but reviled their brethren who accepted it, and thus the old recriminations of Resolutioner and Protester were again renewed between jurants and non-jurants. The latter would hold no communion with their brethren, and lifted up a testimony against their unfaithfulness in protestations and declarations. One of these is not less a curiosity in language than in mingled self-depreciation and self-righteousness—"The Protestation, Apologetic Declaration, and Admonitory Vindication, of a Poor, Wasted, Misrepresented Remnant of the Suffering, Anti-Popish, Anti-Prelatic, Anti-Erastian, Anti-Sectarian, True Presbyterian Church in Scotland." These enthusiasts deprecated separation from the Establishment even while they virtually separated. They declared themselves to be the true Church, and that with them was the Establishment which God and not man had planted. So far they were right. They were the lineal descendants of Covenanted Presbytery, and logically true to their principles. Some writers have condemned "the unmanageable perversity of this obdurate sect," but they were no more obdurate than the old Covenanters. The only difference was that the former Covenanters protested against the errors of Prelacy, and their successors were now equally emphatic against the "backslidings" of Presbytery. On the 27th July 1712 they gathered in great numbers at Auchenshauch, on the borders of Dumfriesshire—familiar covenanting ground—where they renewed the Covenants, and issued the "Auchenshauch

Declaration," protesting against the government oaths, against popery and prelacy, and ending with a general denunciation of all who differed from them. It was virtually the first secession from the Presbyterian Church, the original of many secessions from the Revolution Establishment.

The government had learned wisdom, and the neo-Covenanters were permitted to preach and protest to their hearts' content, no man making them afraid. After the desertion of their three ministers, who had taken refuge in the Assembly, they had for preachers Mr. Hepburn of Urr and Mr. M'Millan of Balmaghie, in Galloway. Mr. Hepburn brought himself within the purview of the civil law and was in prisons oft, and of every prison he made a pulpit for proclaiming his testimony; Mr. M'Millan proved unequal to the rigid discipline of the sect, and its members had to lament "the sinful defection of the man who had led them at Auchenshauch," and whose name, "M'Millanites," for a time they bore.¹

The Assembly which met in May 1714 memorialised the queen on the increase of popery and prelacy in Scotland. The Romanists were said to have made several hundreds of converts in some districts, while their two bishops were openly holding confirmations, and their priests celebrating the mass. The Episcopalians were said to be equally bold, reading the liturgy not only in their own meeting-houses, and in churchyards by the graves of the dead, but in the parish churches which they still held.² To crown all they had seized the Old Church

¹ Burton, viii. 233-243, and list of pamphlets, p. 242, on the subject. Wodrow, *Analecta*, ii. 76. Chambers, *Dom. Ann.* iii. 376-378. The sect continued as the Reformed Presbyterian Church, or Cameronians, until

most of them were received into the Free Church.

² The Presbyterian ministers "had no kind of funeral service for those of any rank whatever."—Burt's *Letters*, i. 268.

of Aberdeen and set up their liturgic worship in it.¹ The Assembly had a right to complain of the liturgy in the parish churches, but obviously their memorial aimed at the forcible suppression of every form of worship in the country but their own. Scotland was to be an exclusive preserve, the promised land of Presbytery, and no other religion was to be tolerated if the General Assembly could help it.

Within a few months of the meeting of this Assembly queen Anne had ceased to reign. She died on the 1st August 1714, the last of the Stuart line in direct succession who occupied the throne. The union of the two kingdoms would alone have made her reign memorable, and it was made doubly so by the galaxy of remarkable men—soldiers, statesmen, and scholars—who by their prowess raised the military prestige and political power of Britain, and by their pens enriched our English literature.

¹ *Acts of Assembly*, p. 491.


CHAPTER XXII

GEORGE I.—1714–1727

Political parties on king's accession—Death and character of Carstares—Earl of Mar and insurrection of 1715—Battle of Sheriffmuir—Arrival of prince James, "the Chevalier," and his departure—Execution of Jacobite leaders—Suppression of Episcopal worship by penal statute, 1719—"Qualified" chapels and ministers—Assembly's flattery of king George—Non-jurors seek union with Eastern Church—Professor Simson's heresies and trials—Auchterarder "Creed"—Marrow controversy—The Erskines—Rival bishops—Death of bishop Rose, 1720—Wranglings of diocesan and college bishops—Bishop Campbell's action—Gadderar bishop of Aberdeen—Battle of the "Usages"—Bishops Cant, Rattray, Keith—Edinburgh presbyters protest against college system—More bishops and more wrangling—Persecution of Roman Catholics—Their numbers.

GEORGE, elector of Hanover, was proclaimed king in Edinburgh on the 5th August 1714 by the title of George the First.¹ The leading Whigs mustered in the capital to show their loyalty to the house of Hanover, while the Jacobites relieved their feelings by pledging at

¹ LINES OF SUCCESSION.



home the health of "the king over the water."¹ In several towns the Jacobites proclaimed James VIII., but the unexpected death of queen Anne found them unprepared for any concerted action. . It was well known that the queen had favoured the claims of her brother, and had been planning with the Jacobite nobles to secure his succession to the throne. The dismissal of the Tory administration after George's accession, and the promotion of the Whigs to office, disconcerted the Jacobites as much as it gratified the Presbyterians. The latter were now as fully allied with the Whigs as were the Episcopalians with the Tories.

The Presbyterians congratulated the king upon his accession, and when the Assembly met in May 1715 he thanked them for their loyalty. Carstares was again moderator for the fourth and last time. He was seized with apoplexy in the month of August, and lingered until the 28th December. When he died the Presbyterians lost their ablest leader, and Scotland one of her most honourable sons. No man stood in the same rank with him as the second founder of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, and none had done more to check and suppress Episcopacy. But he was always an honourable opponent, and used no poisoned weapons in his warfare. On the ground of expediency as much, perhaps, as from principle he preferred Presbytery, and served it faithfully to the end. Though mixed up for many years with political intrigues he was always generous, unselfish, unostentatious. King William said of him, "I have known Carstares long; I have known him well, and I know him to be an honest man." He was honourably

¹ After the proclamation in Glasgow the crowd demolished the Episcopal meeting-house where Mr.

Cockburn had been using the Liturgy. —Burton, viii. 252.

distinguished for many charities, and specially so to the Episcopal clergy whom the Revolution had thrown in beggary upon the world. Many stories are told of his benefactions, but none, perhaps, more touching or edifying than that of the two men who were seen to turn aside at his burial in the Greyfriars' churchyard to conceal their emotion. They were two non-juring Episcopal ministers whose families Carstares had been supporting for some years. Honourable alike to him and to them was the graceful charity and the grateful affection.

Before Carstares' death Scotland was ablaze with civil war. The earl of Mar was dismissed from the office of secretary for Scotland in September 1714. He had offered his services, as several other Highland chiefs had offered theirs, to king George before his arrival in England. After his dismissal Mar hung about the court in London for nearly a year. Disappointed in ambition he returned to Scotland in August, and on the 6th September 1715 raised the standard of insurrection at Braemar. The earl was a plausible schemer, but insincere as a politician and incompetent as a leader. He held at first no commission from the Chevalier, though he had audaciously assumed the highest official position. His influence with the Jacobite chiefs, and the attachment of the Highlanders to the Stuart family, enabled him to muster an army of ten or twelve thousand men. With these he marched south to Perth, and advanced by way of Auchterarder to Sheriffmuir, near Dunblane, where he was met by the earl of Argyll with an army much inferior in numbers, but better disciplined. An indecisive battle was fought here on the 13th November 1715, in which the right wing of each army defeated the left wing of the other—a circumstance which was humorously treated in the ballads of the time. Another section of the Jacobites had marched into

England, expecting to raise their southern sympathisers. This enterprise was attended with as little success as the other, and ended in the defeat and surrender of the Jacobites at Preston.

The cause of James was already hopeless, and it was not improved by his arrival at this juncture in Scotland. Landing at Peterhead on the 22nd December, he held his little court at the earl Marischal's seat at Fetteresso, near Stonehaven, where the Episcopal clergy presented him with an address. They also appointed a day of thanksgiving for his safe arrival, but the Chevalier was careful to attend none of their services. He joined the remnant of Mar's army at Perth, and it was resolved to hold his coronation at the ancient seat of Scone. But there was no coronation. Mar retreated from Perth, which was occupied the day after by Argyll's troops. On the 3rd February 1716, the Chevalier, after a forty days' sojourn in the country, embarked at Montrose for France. Mar prudently went with him. The Chevalier was not made of the stuff to recover a lost throne. It is notorious that there was little about the Hanoverian sovereigns to excite enthusiasm or even loyalty for their persons. No rulers could be personally more uninteresting or less attractive than the first two Georges. The same has to be said of this home-born prince, claimant of his father's and forefathers' throne. He was at an age—twenty-six—which naturally begets enthusiasm ; but instead of a frank and manly bearing, he displayed among his professed subjects a reserve and reticence which chilled them. He was besides in delicate health, affected with ague—whether from constitutional weakness or the Scottish climate is uncertain. Altogether, a less attractive knight-errant never went in quest of a crown. The Jacobites had to pocket their defeat and disappointment,

and presently to settle with king George for the insurrection.

When men, Covenanters or Jacobites, try the hazard of insurrection against powers that be, however they be, there should be no whimpering over payment of the costs. Only, as insurrection is a political offence, it ought to be punished by civil not by religious penalties—the forfeiture of lands, liberty, or life, not the ostracism of men's religion. To punish a man's treason by striking at his religion is the meanest form of persecution. Some of the Jacobite leaders in the insurrection were executed in England, many were sent as slaves to the American plantations. While their fate, especially that of the gallant young earl of Derwentwater, drew much sympathy from both political parties, the government cannot be blamed for protecting itself, even by severe measures, against what it regarded as rebellion.

The measures taken against the Scottish Episcopalians as a body are much less defensible. So far as they were implicated—and many, both clergy and laity, were implicated in the insurrection—they should have been individually punished for the political offence. But in addition to this, the attempt was made forcibly to suppress the religion of the whole body. The king in May 1716 wrote to the lords of Justiciary in Edinburgh, and commanded them to shut the Episcopal chapels in the city, and to prosecute the ministers for not registering their letters of orders and praying for his majesty as required by the Toleration Act. Imagine the Covenanters compelled by Act of Parliament to register their ordination in a civil court, and to pray for Charles II. and James VII. at every diet of worship. The advocate-depute, Duncan Forbes, found that there were legal difficulties in the way of shutting the chapels, but twenty-one out of the twenty-two Episcopal

clergy then officiating in Edinburgh were each fined twenty pounds.¹ Still more severe measures were taken against the clergy in the diocese of Aberdeen. Such of them as were in possession of parish churches were summoned before the presbyteries and deposed. As they defied the sentence they were ejected by the soldiery under orders of the civil court, amid scenes similar to those in the ejection of Presbyterians in the west country. Probably the Episcopal clergy were more obnoxious to the Presbyterian courts for the use of the Liturgy than for their Jacobitism.² Others who officiated in meeting-houses were brought before the magistrates, who shut their chapels, and in some cases imprisoned the ministers. In the Aberdeen diocese alone over thirty clergymen were in this way deprived, of whom two-thirds were parochial ministers.³

These measures were followed by an Act in April 1719, "for making more effectual the laws appointing the oaths for security of the government to be taken by ministers and preachers in churches and meeting-houses in Scotland." By this Act no Episcopal minister could officiate in any place where nine or more persons, in addition to the members of the household, were present, unless he had taken the oath of Abjuration and prayed for the king. The penalty was six months' imprisonment and the closing of the meeting-house for the same period. Under the stress of this enactment some clergymen qualified by taking the oaths, and used the Liturgy in congregations

¹ The Episcopalians had at this time ten places of worship in Edinburgh and twenty-two clergy, being considerably more than the ministers of the Established Church. The clergyman who was exempted from fine by having qualified was Mr. Cockburn, lately driven from Glasgow after the demolition of his chapel. The names of the clergy and the

localities of their chapels—all in obscure places, "wynds" and "closes" in Edinburgh—are given by Dr. Chambers, *Dom. Annals*, iii. 405, 406.

² There were not a few Jacobites among the Presbyterians.

³ Spalding Club *Misc.* i. 64-70; Grub, iii. 376; Cunningham, ii. 372. *Histor. Papers Relating to Jacobite Period*, New Spalding Club, vol. i.

composed chiefly of English families. English clergy soon came over the border and ministered in what were known as "qualified chapels." At first they recognised the Scottish bishops, but when the latter most unwisely refused to recognise them, the breach was opened between Scottish and English Episcopalians which has hardly yet been closed.¹

The members of the Assembly which met in May 1716, in the lull that followed the rising of '15, were profuse in their address to the throne on "the late unnatural treason." They out-Heroded even the bishops' fulsome flattery of James VII., by assuring king George—"We can view with pleasure Heaven interposing in your majesty's behalf and in ours, seating your majesty so seasonably on the throne."² The king rewarded the attachment of the Presbyterians to the house of Hanover by various favours, such as helping them to the repeal of the Act that had restored the Christmas vacation to the Court of Session. But not even royal influence could induce the British Parliament to repeal the Toleration and Patronage Acts.³

In the year 1716, while the Scottish bishops had their hands full at home, they engaged with the English non-jurors in a quixotic attempt to restore communion with the Eastern Church. The metropolitan bishop of Thebais, Arsenius by name, had come to England on a begging expedition in behalf of the suffering Christians in Egypt. Bishop Campbell, who still preferred London society to a Scottish bishopric, discussed with the Eastern prelate the question of reunion. The result was, "A Proposal for a Concordate betwixt the Orthodox and

¹ There are still three or four congregations calling themselves "the Church of England" in Scotland, in spite of the contradiction in terms.

² *Acts of Assembly*, p. 570.

³ The Assembly sent two ministers,

Mitchell and Hamilton, to London in 1717 to remonstrate against both Acts. They had an audience of the king, but nothing came of it.—*Mitchell's Diary*, Spalding Club, i. 227, 253; Burton, viii. 385-387.

Catholic Remnant of the British Churches and the Catholic and Apostolic Oriental Church." The British prelates, in treating of the five ancient patriarchates,—Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Rome, and Constantinople,—agreed that Jerusalem should be recognised as the mother Church whence all other Churches have been derived, and that Constantinople should hold equal rank with Rome. The subjects on which they disagreed with the Eastern Church were then stated in the following five articles: They could not assign to the canons of general councils the same authority as to the sacred Scriptures; and while honouring the Blessed Virgin they dare not unduly exalt her; nor could they invoke saints and angels; nor worship the sacred symbols of Christ's presence in the Holy Eucharist, nor the images of saints, though they counted it not unlawful to assist the imagination by pictures and representations of them.

Arsenius had undertaken the delicate negotiations, and on returning home by Russia he laid the proposals before the Czar Peter, who entertained them favourably. A synod, attended by three Eastern patriarchs and other prelates and clergy, was held at Constantinople for consideration of the Concordat; and in 1721 "The Answers of the Orthodox in the East to the Proposals sent from Britain for a Union and Agreement with the Oriental Church" arrived in England. The orthodox Easterns, placidly conservative, vindicated the practice of their Church upon the five points, and condemned with some acrimony the opinions of the British bishops. In May 1722 the Scottish bishops, Campbell and Gadderar, and the English non-juring prelates, Collier and Brett, sent a learned reply in Greek, Latin, and English, supporting their views by arguments from the Holy Scriptures and the primitive Fathers, "for the stream," they say, "runs

clearest towards the fountain head." All that they asked was that the Eastern Church should authoritatively declare that British churchmen were "not obliged to the invocation of saints and angels, the worship of images, and the adoration of the host," and, these points being conceded, they might still "conciliate an union." Arsenius and the Czar Peter, both bent on the union, proposed that two British clergymen should be sent to Russia for a friendly conference with the Russian clergy. Meanwhile the uncompromising patriarchs had sent their final decision from a synod held at Constantinople in September 1723. "These doctrines," they said, "have been long since examined, and rightly and religiously defined and settled by the holy œcumenical synods, so that it is neither lawful to add anything to them nor to take anything from them; therefore they who are disposed to agree with us in the divine doctrines of the orthodox faith must necessarily follow and submit to what has been defined and determined by the ancient Fathers, and by holy and œcumenical synods from the time of the Apostles and their holy successors, the fathers of our Church, to this time; we say they must submit to them with sincerity and obedience, and without any dispute or scruple; and this is a sufficient answer to what you have written." This deliverance was signed by Jeremiah, archbishop of Constantinople and œcumenical patriarch, Athanasius, patriarch of Antioch, Chrysanthus, patriarch of Jerusalem, Callinicus, metropolitan of Heraclea, and by the bishops of Cyzicus, Nicomedia, Nice, Chalcedon, Thessalonica, Pruza, Polypolis, and Varna. Shortly after receipt of this synodical decision news reached England of the death of the Czar, and the project, which was hopeless from the beginning, was finally dropped.¹

¹ Skinner, ii. 634-639; Thos. Stephen, iv. 148; Grub, iii. 400-404. See

While these negotiations were being conducted between West and East, the Presbyterian Church was troubled with a series of incipient heresies which made no small stir in its courts. Hitherto, with the exception of the Bourignon episode, Presbyterianism had been chiefly engaged in battling with Prelacy. Now that there was little to fear from that quarter it found foes in its own household. The first reputed heretic was John Simson, professor of divinity in Glasgow, who was accused of what some called Pelagianism and others Arminianism. He was afterwards delated before the courts on the more serious charge of Arianism. The first case began in 1714, and the last ended in 1729. On the first charge he was censured by the Assembly of 1717 for unguarded language, and dismissed with an admonition; for the second and graver offence he was suspended from his office. Thomas Boston, minister of Ettrick, the author of *The Fourfold State*, was the only member who protested against the sentence, and he did so on the ground of its leniency. Simson cannot be credited with much theological learning, and although his trials extended over a long period, and bred much acrimony in the Church courts, they had no lasting influence upon Scottish theology.¹

Between the two trials of Simson the presbytery of Auchterarder provided material for another controversy. As the professor's heretical opinions were in the air, its presbytery had drawn up a series of propositions to test the orthodoxy of young licentiates. One of these tests was expressed as follows: "I believe that it is not sound

also as to this correspondence letters published by George Williams, London, 1868, with introduction containing an account of previous intercourse between the English and Eastern Churches.

¹ *Acts of Assembly*, pp. 500-608; *Wodrow Correspondence*, ii. 261 seq.; M'Kerrow's *Hist. of Secession Ch.* pp. 8-26; Chambers, *Dom. Annals*, iii. 441, 486, 487; Burton, viii. 399, 400; Cunningham, ii. 373-413.

and orthodox to teach that we must forsake sin in order to our coming to Christ, and instating us in covenant with God." This was probably the baldest form in which Antinomianism had yet appeared. A licentiate named Craig declined the formula, and appealed to the Assembly against the presbytery's refusal to grant him a licence. The Assembly of 1717 condemned "the Auchterarder creed," and censured its authors. Wodrow states that the controversy was the occasion of much comment, not only in Scotland, but in the coffee-houses of London, where it was discussed by the wits of the city.¹

The Auchterarder case was followed by a controversy of wider notoriety, which may be regarded as its theological sequence—the "Marrow Controversy." During the Commonwealth, when Puritanism prevailed, there was published in England *The Marrow of Modern Divinity: Part First, touching the Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace: Part Second, touching the most plain, pithy, and spiritual Exposition of the Ten Commandments*. The author was Edward Fisher, a commoner of Brazenose college, Oxford. Thomas Boston, when minister of Simprin in Berwickshire, had picked up a copy of the book, and finding in it an antidote to the teaching which he believed was poisoning the wells of orthodoxy, he mentioned it to his friends. This led in 1718 to a republication of *The Marrow*, with a preface by James Hog, minister of Carnock, and to the opening of an acrimonious controversy in which the opposing parties freely flung pamphlets and sermons at each other. The Marrow Men were denounced as Antinomians (contemners of the law), and they retaliated by calling their opponents Legalists. A committee of the Assembly reported at its meeting, in May 1720, that they had found these five

¹ *Correspondence*, ii. 269.

separate heresies in the book :—That assurance was of the essence of faith ; that the Atonement was universal ; that holiness was not necessary to salvation ; that the fear of punishment and the hope of reward were not motives in a believer's obedience ; and that the believer is not under the law as a rule of life. The report also contained six Antinomian paradoxes culled from the *Marrow*, namely : "A believer is not under the law, but is altogether delivered from it ; a believer doth not commit sin ; the Lord can see no sin in a believer ; the Lord is not angry with a believer for his sins ; the Lord does not chastise a believer for his sins ; a believer hath no cause either to confess his sins, or to crave pardon at the hands of God for them." The Assembly condemned the teaching as contrary to the Scriptures and the Confession of Faith, and enjoined all ministers to warn their parishioners against it.¹ Twelve ministers afterwards signed a protest against the Assembly's findings, and came to be known as "The Marrow Men." Among their number were Hog, Boston, and the two Erskines, Ebenezer and his brother Ralph. The Erskines afterwards became the leaders in a secession from the Presbyterian Establishment.

Certain writers have with some ingenuity attempted to show that the new doctrines which distracted the Presbyterian Church owed their introduction to the influence of the Episcopal clergy who conformed at the Revolution and kept possession of their benefices. But their number at this time was probably not more than fifty, and most of them held northern parishes that were little affected by the prevalent controversies. The ministers who agitated the Church belonged for the most part to

¹ *Acts of Assembly*, pp. 534-536 ; *Correspondence*, ii. 269-271 ; Burton, *Struthers' History*, i. 478-510 ; viii. 400-402.
M'Kerrow, pp. 9-20 ; Wodrow,

the Covenanting districts, and were altogether free from episcopal influence. The earlier annals of Presbyterianism show that it required no extraneous aid to create dissension in its ranks ; and its subsequent history affords ample illustration of the same divisive tendency. The Resolutioners and Protesters of the seventeenth century reappear in the eighteenth as Moderates and Evangelicals, who waged substantially the old warfare, until one secession after another, down to the Disruption of 1843, stripped the Presbyterian Establishment of half its numerical strength.¹

What little interest there is in the contemporary annals of Episcopacy revolves round the consecration of bishops—sometimes of rival bishops—and the discreditable wranglings in which they strove to outmanœuvre each other to the detriment of the Church they professed to rule. Presbyterians always fell out when they were in the heyday of their power. It was the full cup they could not carry. When persecution came it knit them together as one man. Episcopalians, or rather their bishops, reserved internal dissension for the day of their depression, as if the better to expose their weakness to the world.

In October 1718 two bishops—Irvine and Millar—were consecrated in Edinburgh. Both had been ejected at the Revolution,—Irvine from Kirkmichael, Ayrshire, and Millar from Inveresk. Irvine had been a conspicuous Jacobite partisan, acting as chaplain to Dundee's army before the battle of Killiecrankie, and again in the later rising of 1715, when he officiated to the Jacobite army at Kelso. He was imprisoned for his share in both transactions.²

¹ Struthers' *History of the Relief Church*, pp. 189, 190. Skinner, ii. 621 ; Lockhart *Papers*, ii. 119.

² Keith's *Catalogue*, p. 526 ;

A memorable link with the past was broken by the death of bishop Rose, in March 1720. He was the last of the pre-Revolution bishops, and had latterly concentrated in himself the whole government of the Episcopal Church to the exclusion of his brother prelates.¹ History furnishes no precedent for this singular arrangement, and the unwisdom of it was soon apparent in the discordant action of the remaining bishops. Of these there were four in Scotland—Fullarton, Falconer, Irvine, and Millar—and Campbell and Gadderar in London. That bane of Scottish Episcopacy—the royal prerogative—still hampered the independent action of both clergy and laity. The Chevalier was now represented in Scotland by a body of trustees, of whom Lockhart of Carnwath was the most active, and whose position resembled that of the Scots Privy Council under Charles II. This body, acting in concert with the “king’s” court, first at St. Germain’s, and then at Albano, permitted the consecration of bishops for Scotland, but suspended all appointments to particular dioceses. The bishops had no special work entrusted to them save that of continuing the succession. This enthralled the Church to the king, as represented by the trustees, who could play upon the ambition of the clergy, by holding out to them the prospect of ecclesiastical dignities at the longed-for Restoration, of which they were sanguine. In the meantime all Episcopal acts were virtually suspended, discipline relaxed or capriciously exercised, and the bishops reduced to a knot of men in Edinburgh and its neighbourhood. There they lived, learned and dignified, but in a false position, inextricably bound up with a political cause, and

¹ Keith (bishop), who was a presbyter for seven years under bishop Rose, speaks of him as “a sweet-natured man” (*Catalogue*, p. 65); and Burton describes him as “a man

of quietness and sense.”—*History*, viii. 419. All the same, his peculiar policy was both bad in principle and injurious in its effects.

depending entirely on the voluntary recognition and support of the clergy and laity whom they professed to rule and lead.

After Rose's death the four resident bishops met forty-eight of the clergy at Edinburgh in April, and laid before them credentials of their consecration. Bishop Fullarton was elected by the presbyters to the diocese of Edinburgh, or rather to perform Episcopal acts within the diocese, and the bishops confirmed the election. They agreed at the same time to form themselves into an Episcopal College, exercising corporate jurisdiction over the whole community, and to confer upon Fullarton the title of *primus*, but without any metropolitan authority.¹ These proceedings were duly reported to the Chevalier, who gave them his royal approbation, with the proviso that future appointments to the Episcopate should have his previous sanction.² Following upon the election of Fullarton to Edinburgh, the clergy of Angus invited bishop Falconer to assume the episcopal supervision of their district, and the clergy of Aberdeen made a similar request to bishop Campbell in London. Campbell was an advocate of the "Usages," which had caused a split among the English Non-jurors, and the Episcopal College would only sanction his election on condition of his not introducing them in Aberdeen. The bishop-elect would give no such promise, nor was he disposed to relinquish his London quarters for the cold northern see. Maintaining his claim to be canonical bishop of Aberdeen he deputed bishop Gadderar as his suffragan; and notwithstanding the irregularity of his appointment Gadderar was accepted by the clergy.³

¹ Their theory was that the College was the metropolitan while the metropolitan office was "in commission." *Primus inter pares* is the key to the position, and as such the bishop of Edinburgh acted.

² Lockhart *Papers*, ii. 35-42; Skinner, ii. 628, 629; Lawson, pp. 520-522.

³ Lockhart *Papers*, ii. 101, 102; Lawson, pp. 234, 235; Skinner, ii. 630; Thomas Stephen, iv. 165.

Two other presbyters, Andrew Cant and David Freebairn, were promoted to the Episcopate in October 1722. Freebairn had no other qualification for the office than the nomination of the Chevalier, which the bishops could not resist, little as they liked it. Cant was the son of the principal of Edinburgh University, and grandson of the famous Covenanting minister of Aberdeen. According to Lockhart,¹ bishop Cant "was a person qualified in all respects to be at the head of any Church in Christendom, being a man of great learning and integrity."²

It was at this period that the battle of the "Usages" began. It is a chapter in ecclesiastical history over which Episcopalians would willingly draw a veil. The war was waged chiefly by the bishops, as the presbyters had as yet few constitutional rights, which their superiors were not disposed to enlarge. It has been observed that after the Revolution the bishops and clergy, freed from State trammels, began to introduce the Prayer Book, and to recover for the Church the lost heritage of liturgic worship. The English service was used by some, while others in celebrating the Holy Communion preferred the Liturgy of 1637, which gave a colourable support to the Usages. So far as the Eucharistic office was concerned, the Usages contended for were (1) mixing water with the wine; (2) commemoration of the faithful departed; (3) the invocation of the Holy Spirit in the consecration; (4) and the prayer of oblation in which the Christian sacrifice was solemnly offered to God. There were other Usages to which less importance was attached, such as immersion in baptism, and the chrism in confirmation and in the anointing of the sick.

Campbell was very severe in his reply to the Scottish bishops, calling Fullarton a pope, and Millar and Irvine his cardinals.

¹ *Papers*, ii. 237.

² See to same effect obituary notice of Cant in Chambers's *Dom. Annals*, iii. 631.

The College bishops, partisans and most of them nominees of the exiled prince, were opposed to the Usages; the diocesan bishops favoured them. The Episcopal College met at Edinburgh in December 1722, and discussed the question without coming to any agreement. Lockhart was present as the agent of the Chevalier, and counselled unity in the interests of both Church and State. Falconer and Gadderar—the latter was on his way to Aberdeen—defended the Usages on primitive authority, and Gadderar gave proof of his independence by insisting on the Church's indefeasible right to settle the controversy without regard to any external authority. The Episcopal College met again in February, Gadderar and Falconer being absent, and issued a letter¹ to clergy and laity against what they deemed the more objectionable of the Usages—the mixed chalice and prayers for the dead. Dr. Rattray, a learned presbyter and afterwards bishop, criticised the circular letter in severe terms, pointing out the constitutional defects in the College system of administration, and defending the Usages as "necessary parts of the highest act of public Christian worship, and of divine appointment, as being instituted by Christ himself, or by His Apostles, and by them delivered to the Catholic Church."²

Bishop Falconer died in July 1723, and left an honourable name alike for learning, for humility, and for charity.³ In the following year the "First Concordate," containing five articles of agreement, was signed by the bishops, and in these Gadderar, while maintaining his principles, yielded some of the points in dispute for the sake of peace. The bishops, on their part, confirmed him

¹ Letter in Lawson, pp. 527-529.

² Lockhart *Papers*, ii. 94-99; Skinner, ii. 630-632; Thomas Stephen, iv. 183-201.

³ See a sympathetic account of his life, "Bishop John Falconer and his Friends," in *Scot. Eccles. Journal*, vol. iii.

in the bishopric of Aberdeen as the elect of the clergy, and in no sense as the suffragan of bishop Campbell. Four more bishops had been proposed by the Episcopal College, and Lockhart had obtained the sanction of James for their consecration. All the four nominees had been ministers in the Church before the Revolution—Duncan at Kilbirnie, Norrie at Dundee, James Rose, a brother of the late bishop of Edinburgh, at Monimail, and Ochterlonie at Aberlemno, of which parish he had kept possession until the year 1716. Like most of the king's nominees they had no special ability or learning qualifying them for the office of bishop.¹ Their appointment proceeded from an objectionable system, Erastian to the core, and without a redeeming feature.

Bishop Duncan was appointed over the district of Glasgow, and bishop Norrie over Angus and Mearns. The former was accepted by the presbyters but the latter was opposed by a majority of both clergy and laity, who had expressed their preference for Dr. Rattray of Craighall, "a worshipful Perthshire laird." At a meeting of the Episcopal College in 1724, the earl of Panmure advocated the claims of Rattray, and the earl of Strathmore and lord Gray supported bishop Norrie. Lockhart, who was present as usual, asked the court in whom the power of election was vested. Lord Panmure answered warmly that by the ancient usage of the Church of Scotland the right belonged to the dean and chapter, but as that was now impracticable, the best method to adopt was to follow the custom of the primitive Church, in which bishops were elected by the free voice of the clergy, with the approval of the people. Lockhart professed the greatest reverence for the customs of the Fathers, but did not regard them as binding under all circumstances, and he advised them to

¹ Grub, iii. 396.

take warning from the disputes among the Presbyterians arising out of the popular "call" to their ministers. He presently showed his hand by claiming the right of episcopal appointments for the king, and intimated that the royal prerogative would in future be exercised. The result was that the meeting broke up without any decision. Bishop Norrie was afterwards appointed by the College bishops to the district, and the primus was instructed by James that in future no district should be assigned to a bishop without his consent.¹

The next cause of dissension was the appointment of a successor to primus Fullarton, who had now reached an advanced age. Lockhart recommended bishop Irvine, and on his death, in 1725, the names of Cant and Duncan were suggested. The Edinburgh presbyters were not disposed to have a bishop placed over them without their consent, and sent a strong remonstrance to the Episcopal College against their system of administration, calling upon them to recover the ancient rights of the Church to self-government, which had been trampled upon since the Reformation, and accusing James of violating his engagements to the bishops by the manner of his appointments.² Robert Keith³ was one of the remonstrating presbyters, and Lockhart expressed to him his surprise at "finding his name at a paper so seditious, false, and unmannerly." On finding Keith resolute for a reform of the College system, he stigmatised the remonstrants as "a parcel of little factious priests in the diocese of Edinburgh who, as they

¹ Lockhart *Papers*, ii. 124 *seq.*; Dr. Rattray's *Protestation*, Appendix to his *Essay on the Church*; Lawson, pp. 240, 241.

² Lockhart *Papers*, ii. 325, represents the action of the Edinburgh presbyters as instigated by bishop Millar, who wished to succeed Ful-

larton in the see.

³ Afterwards bishop, and author of *Keith's Affairs*, and of *Catalogue of Scot. Bps.* He was a relative of the earl Marischal and brother of the famous field-marshal Keith. See *Life of Keith* prefixed to his *Catalogue*.

were serving the Covenanted cause, should change their black gowns into brown cloaks.”¹ This was about the last appearance for a time of Lockhart in Scotland. The government was informed of his correspondence with the Chevalier, for which information he blamed “the factious bishops,” and for safety he sailed to Rotterdam.

The unseemly strife was not yet ended. The primus Fullarton and bishop Norrie both died in the spring of 1727. Bishop Millar, whom Lockhart accuses of first aiming at the archiepiscopal see of St. Andrews, which he wished to be restored, and then intriguing for the successorship to Fullarton, was elected by the clergy of Edinburgh as their diocesan. Bishops Gadderar and Cant confirmed the election, making Millar not only primus, but vicar-general and metropolitan. Fullarton had no such authority, and the conferring it upon his successor by a fraction of the Episcopate was as uncanonical as it was unseemly. The four College bishops protested against the whole procedure. They were now four to the Diocesan three. The election of Dr. Rattray for the diocese of Brechin made their numbers equal. On the 4th June 1727 the diocesan bishops, still further to assert their superiority, consecrated William Dunbar, formerly minister of Cruden, to the see of Moray, and Robert Keith to be coadjutor of Edinburgh. The four collegians, not to be outstripped in the race, consecrated on the 27th June John Gillan and David Ranken, both presbyters in Edinburgh, to be bishops at large. Again the numbers stood equal—six bishops on either side. “And thus,” says Skinner, “the contention between the College and those who favoured the old regular system came to be managed, if not by equal arguments, yet by equal numbers.”²

¹ Lockhart *Papers*, ii. 325-329.

also Thomas Stephen, iv, 246-251;

² *Eccles. Hist.* ii. 644, 645. See

Lockhart *Papers*, ii. 333, 334.

Immediately after the consecration of Dunbar and Keith the Diocesan bishops met in Edinburgh and framed six canons, placing the government of the Church on a diocesan basis, and conferring metropolitan powers upon the bishop of Edinburgh until the restoration of the see of St. Andrews. They followed this up by an overture to the College bishops in the interests of peace and order. The olive branch was held out in vain to the collegians, who answered their brethren by suspending bishop Millar, and appointing bishop Freebairn to the superintendence of Edinburgh. The indignation of the Church was, however, growing strong against this obsequious deference to a royal supremacy which was already a vanishing quantity. The Chevalier's right was still asserted by him or his agents, but seldom without being challenged. The diocesan bishops were, besides, the stronger men, not only from ability and learning, but also from their social position and resources and residence in their districts, whereas their rivals were largely dependent upon the uncertain bounty of James's court at Albano. No more bishops at large were appointed, and the miserable schism after a few fitful spasms died a natural death.

The Roman Catholics, who were naturally all Jacobites, were involved in the political persecutions that followed the rising of 1715. In the midst of these persecutions bishop Nicolson died at Preshome, Banffshire, in October 1718, leaving the mission in the hands of bishop Gordon. In 1720 John Wallace, a native of Arbroath, and mission priest in that town, of which his father had been provost, was raised to the Episcopate, being privately consecrated in Edinburgh by bishop Gordon assisted by two priests. The royal prerogative was exercised in the case of bishop Wallace.¹ The new bishop was too advanced in age to

¹ Gualtero Collection in British Museum containing James' letter re-

be of much active assistance to bishop Gordon, who continued his superintendence of the Highlands and Islands, assigning the Lowlands to his coadjutor. In 1722, on a second visitation of the western district, bishop Gordon confirmed over two thousand people, of whom many were converts and persons of position. He reports to Propaganda that the persecution of the Roman Catholics was more relentless at this time than at any former period, but that, notwithstanding, the people remained loyal to their inherited faith, and that many who had lapsed from it were recovered by the zeal of the mission priests.¹ Great difficulty was found in getting native priests suitable to the hard climate and to the exceptional difficulties of the Roman mission. Money came from Rome from time to time; but men, natives of the country, were wanted even more than money. Foreign coin could be converted and made serviceable; foreign priests were not so easily convertible, though in earlier days, and since the Reformation, they had done hard work in Scotland. A third bishop, in the person of Alexander Grant, then resident in Rome, was nominated in 1726 as a coadjutor to strengthen the hands of the two aged bishops. The bishop-designate, who accepted the nomination with reluctance, died somewhat mysteriously either at Genoa or Marseilles on his way to Scotland, and no further appointment was made for some years.²

commending Wallace to the Holy See: cited by Burton, viii. 428, note, and by Bellesheim, iv. 183. James seems to have also had a hand in the nomination of Irish R. C. bishops.

¹ See Report of bishops Gordon and Wallace to Propaganda, 4th July 1730, in Bellesheim, iv. 383-388. The following illustration of the times is given by the translator of Bellesheim, iv. 188, note: "There is a story well known in the Highlands of one of the Macleans of Coll, who was himself an elder of the Kirk, and was reproved

by the General Assembly for suffering his islanders to remain in the darkness of Popery. The laird accordingly posted himself on Sunday morning at a convenient spot where two roads led respectively to kirk and chapel, and proceeded to knock down with his yellow cane any one whom he saw making his way to the latter. Hence Presbyterianism was known by the name of *creidimh a bhata bhui*, the creed of the yellow stick."

² Bellesheim, iv. 181-189, and Appendix, pp. 377-383.

CHAPTER XXIII

GEORGE II., 1727-1760

Concordat between diocesan and College bishops—Assignment of dioceses—Deposition of John Glass—Formation of "Glassites" or "Sandemanians"—Wodrow the historian—Patronage disturbs Presbyterian Church—Riding Committees—Ebenezer Erskine opposes patronage, and is censured by Assembly—Erskine and other three ministers deposed—Formation of "The Associate Presbytery" in 1733—Sympathy with Seceders—Their growth into "Associate Synod"—Preaching of Whitfield—His quarrel with Seceders—Whitfield returns to Scotland, 1742—Preaches at the Cambuslang revival—Death of Gadderar—His work and policy—Death of Rattray—His literary works—Episcopal Synod, 1743, and its code of canons—Protest of Edinburgh presbyters—Effects of persecution upon Episcopalians and Roman Catholics—Jansenism among Scottish Romanists—Prince Charles Edward and the insurrection of 1745—Renewed persecution of Episcopalians—Severity of penal statutes, 1746 and 1748—Penal statutes against Roman Catholics—Seceders separate into Burghers and Anti-Burghers—John Wesley's visit—Small stipends and patronage in Established Church—Deposition of Gillespie and formation of "The Presbytery of Relief," 1761—Assembly deals with David Hume and John Home—Reflections on life and morals of the period.

THE Episcopal Church, from the political folly and personal wrangling of its rulers, was steadily going down the hill of declension. Its history, consequently, through most of the eighteenth century, is painfully dreary and disappointing, relieved by little but the two insurrections, the '15 and the '45, and their accompanying persecutions, each bringing Episcopacy nearer the verge of extinction. The story points the moral that dynasties may rise and

fall, but the rulers of Christ's kingdom should put its sacred interests supreme above all. It may also adorn the tale sung in many a Jacobite ballad of the romantic devotion of Scottish Episcopalians to the white cockade. Meanwhile the kingdom of Christ, as they must have regarded their waning Communion, was being inevitably sacrificed to this political chimera.

Bishop Millar's primacy was brief, and failed to restore peace among his brethren. On his death in October 1727, Andrew Lumsden, an aged presbyter of Edinburgh, was elected to the see by the clergy. To conciliate the College bishops he refused to sign the canons of June, or to exercise the powers of metropolitan. Time, however, favoured the diocesans, and as their influence extended, the College bishops in December 1731 accepted a concordat, which, if it failed in its immediate object, paved the way for a better administration. The "Articles of Agreement" were (1) that only the Scottish or English Liturgy should be used, and that the Usages should not be introduced;¹ (2) that no bishop should be consecrated without the consent of a majority of the bishops; (3) that presbyters should not elect a bishop without a mandate from the primus; (4) that the bishops should choose the primus; (5) the bishops intimated that they had made choice of bishop Freebairn as their primus; (6) and that the diocese of Glasgow had been assigned to bishop Duncan, Dunblane to Gillan, Fife to Rose, Dunkeld to Rattray, Brechin to Ochterlonie, Aberdeen to Gadderar, Moray and Ross to Dunbar, Edinburgh to Lumsden, and Caithness, Orkney, and the Isles to Keith. The bishops were careful to add, "By the foresaid division

¹ This could not have included the invocation and oblation, because both were in actual use in the Scottish

Office and also in the Liturgy of 1637.

of districts we do not pretend to claim any legal title to dioceses.”¹

The Presbyterians were not more free than their rivals from faction and division. During the next thirty years there were three secessions from the Established Church, preceded in one instance by the din of a long controversy. The first originated with the Rev. John Glass, minister of Tealing, Forfarshire, who was deposed by the Assembly's commission in 1730. There is nothing in the traditions of Presbyterianism to account for the genesis of Glass's views. It is easy to connect the other secessions with diverging party lines years before the inevitable separation came, but the heresy of John Glass must have taken the Presbyterians by surprise. The opinions he broached have something in common with those of Edward Irving in the next century, but that makes it none the less singular that they found a voice in Angus a century before. As early as 1725 Glass had denounced the National Covenant and the Solemn League as Judaistic in substance, intolerant in spirit, and inconsistent with the charity of the Gospel. He was equally opposed to the legal establishment of religion as out of harmony with the spiritual character of Christ's kingdom. That character he endeavoured to impress by reviving the weekly communion of the primitive Church, and by the associations of the love feast, the kiss of peace, and the washing of the disciples' feet. People made merry over the peculiarities of the Glassites, and even the sedate Wodrow had his joke at their expense. "We have," he writes in 1730, "some stories as if Mr. Glass and his company were bringing in some surprising novelties, as the holy kiss, saying Amen, the use of the Lord's Prayer." "The poor

¹ The Articles are here given in *Catalogue*, p. 527; Skinner, ii. 645-summary. See Grub, iv. 7; Keith's 647; Lawson, pp. 530-532.

man is still going on in his wildnesses, and comical things are talked of his public rebukes for defects and excesses in the Christian kiss he has introduced to his meetings.”¹

Mr. Glass after his deposition removed from Tealing to Dundee, where he formed a congregation which still exists in continuity, and afterwards to Perth, where his adherents built him a church. So highly was the good man esteemed that the Assembly, on the representation of the synod of Angus, of which Glass had been a member, restored him in 1739 to the status of a minister of the Gospel, but, somewhat equivocally, not to a status within the Establishment until he should recant. Glass did not recant. The little sect still survives, not so prominent in the multitude of modern sects as it was in the life of its founder, when it numbered one among few. His son-in-law, Sandeman, carried his teaching to England, where the community is known as the Sandemanians. Although the sect has failed to catch the popular ear, or to make any sensible impression upon the country, it had the honour of including in its membership one of the most illustrious and religious of modern scientists, Michael Faraday.

As Wodrow's history closed, and also his life, at this time a brief reference is due to him as an author. The son of a professor in Glasgow, he was in early life made librarian of the University, in which capacity he acquired his taste for historical research. On leaving the college he became minister of Eastwood, then a rural parish, but now a southern suburb of Glasgow, where he died in 1734 at the age of fifty-five. He produced four historical works—a *History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland* from the Restoration to the Revolution, in which he shows himself a true son of the Covenants; the

¹ Wodrow, *Correspondence*, iii. Morren's *Annals of Gen. Assembly*, i. 458-460, 480-482; Burton, viii. 417; 10.

Analecta, a collection of "particular providences," a work which illustrates the amazing superstition of the author and of his times; *Collections of the Lives of the Reformers*; and last, but not the least valuable, his *Correspondence*, containing numerous letters from 1709 to 1731, many of them written in a gossiping vein to his wife and friends from the General Assemblies, of which he was an annual attender whether a member or not. In these letters he gives interesting details of speeches made in the Assembly, which to Wodrow was the grandest convocation in the world. His writings, especially his *Correspondence*, are of undoubted value to the student, but they have to be read with caution and with the aid of contemporary side-lights.¹

The question of patronage again troubled the Established Church. It became a wedge which split irrevocably asunder the Moderates and the popular party. The former, who had now a majority in the Assembly, maintained the rights of patrons based upon the Act of 1690; the latter advocated for the first time the divine right of the parishioners to elect the minister, and cited in their support the Act of 1649. Presbyteries were uncertain how to act in contested cases, and the superior courts added to the confusion by inconsistent decisions based upon no fixed principle. At last the Assembly hit upon the expedient of appointing a committee of its own body to execute its orders in disputed settlements. It was immediately ridiculed as the "Riding Committee," from its sometimes over-riding the wishes of both presbyteries and people. In 1731 the Assembly transmitted an overture, under the Barrier Act, for the opinion of presbyteries on the proposal that the election should lie with the elders and protestant heritors, and in burghs with the elders and town council. When the next

¹ See Burton, viii. 380-383, and notes.

Assembly met in 1732 it was found that the presbyteries were very much divided in opinion, although the Moderates claimed that the returns were favourable to their views. Ebenezer Erskine, minister of Stirling, was an ardent advocate on the popular side, and indignantly asked the Assembly with reference to the patronage heritors—"What difference does a piece of land make between man and man in the affairs of Christ's kingdom, which is not of this world? . . . We are told that 'God hath chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith.' It is not said that He hath chosen the heritors of this world as we have done; and if the poor be the heirs of the kingdom, I wish to know by what warrant they are stripped of the privileges of the kingdom." The Assembly, notwithstanding, passed the overture and made it law. Erskine and other ministers protested, but their protest was not received. Another protestation rejected in this Assembly was a lengthy "Representation and Petition," signed by forty-two ministers and three elders, inveighing against various sins of the Kirk, such as "the innovation of read sermons, obstructive of all spiritual edification," and specially lamenting "an almost boundless toleration in Scotland, whereby error, superstition, and profaneness are much encouraged, and the discipline of this Church weakened by withdrawing the concurrence of the civil magistrate."¹

Erskine and his friends though defeated were not dispirited. On the first Sunday after his return to Stirling he asserted in the pulpit the divine right of the popular call. He had a better platform for his declamation when preaching at Perth as moderator of the synod at its autumn meeting. Taking as his text, "The stone which the builders refused," he condemned at length the

¹ *Acts of Assembly*, pp. 620, 621; Thomson's *Hist. of Secession Ch. p. Struthers' History*, i. 597, *seq.*; 37; M'Kerrow, pp. 31-41.

Assembly's Act, and said, among other things,—“Whatever Church authority may be in that Act, yet it wants the authority of the Son of God. And seeing the reverend synod has put me in this place, where I am in Christ's stead, I must be allowed to say of this Act what I apprehend Christ Himself would say of it were He personally present where I am, and that is, that by this Act the corner stone is receded from ; He is rejected in His poor members, and the rich of the world put in their room.” Erskine is better entitled to sympathy for his manly defence of the people's rights than for the style of his advocacy. The synod, by a majority of six, *censured* him for the sermon. He protested along with the minority, and appealed to the Assembly.

Next year Erskine defended himself before the Assembly, arguing that all Acts of Assembly were not standards of discipline nor convertible into terms of communion, else the conscience of men would be enslaved by a mass of heterogeneous legislation ; and that ministers were not thereby precluded from preaching against what they regarded as error. The Assembly found that the language of his synodical sermon was “offensive, and tended to disturb the peace of the Church,” and ordered him to be rebuked at the bar. Erskine answered the rebuke by laying a protest on the table signed by himself and three faithful followers—Wilson, minister of Perth, Moncrieff of Abernethy, and Fisher of Aberdalgie. The Assembly treated the protest as a defiance of its authority, and again summoned the protesters. In the end the recalcitrant ministers were relegated to the commission, which received power to suspend them at its August sitting if they were still intractable ; and should they be found in November to have disregarded the suspension, they were to be visited with higher censure.

They appeared in August before the commission, prepared as usual with another protest, which Erskine read "in a very deliberate manner, and with a very audible voice," while a friend "held a candle to him, for it was late." This is a scene which deserved to be painted by a Wilkie. November found the four protesters still impenitent. They had not obeyed the suspension of August, and the commission, finding its authority thus openly defied, deposed them from their charges, and declared them no longer ministers of the Church. The four ejected ministers thereupon presented a protest against their unjust condemnation, disowning the sentence as null and void, and disavowing all communion with their judges until they saw their sins amended, and finally appealing to "the first free, faithful, and reforming General Assembly of the Church of Scotland."¹

Both parties had got into a false position from which neither was willing to recede. Erskine made the first mistake in his violent attack upon the Assembly. As the supreme court of the Presbyterian Church its decisions were at least entitled to respect as laws of the Church. But if Erskine deserved censure, the manner of dealing with him, refusing his protest, and consigning him to the summary jurisdiction of the commission, was not less blameworthy. It almost made it impossible for a high-spirited man like Erskine to resile from his position. The Moderates afterwards saw their mistake, and sought to win the Seceders back to the fold. The protest of the Marrow Men had been received, and the Assembly was none the worse. The breeze blew over, and secession was avoided. So it might have been now with more judicious management.

¹ *Acts of Assembly*, pp. 620-626; 619-643; Gib's *Display*, i. 26-35; Thomson's *Hist. of Secession Ch.* pp. M'Kerrow, pp. 43-64.
37, 47-49; Struthers' *History*, i.

The four deposed ministers met in December 1733 at Gairney Bridge, near Kinross, where they formed themselves into "The Associate Presbytery," and framed their first manifesto as a separate community—"A Testimony to the Doctrine, Worship, Government, Discipline of the Church of Scotland." And so, like other seceders after them, they claimed to be "the true Church of Scotland."

Popular sympathy was with the Seceders. They were known to be spiritually-minded men, devoted to their ministry, and were regarded by the common people as the champions of their rights. The Assembly, when too late, retraced its steps, repealing the obnoxious Acts of 1730 and 1732, and empowering the synod of Perth to receive the deposed ministers again into communion with the Church. The presbytery of Stirling, further to show their good-will, elected Erskine as their moderator, and begged him to accept the office. Erskine declined, the bridge was crossed, and there was to be no return. Sympathy was expressed with the Seceders from many quarters both within and without the Establishment, from the remnant Cameronians and from Ulster Presbyterians. In 1736 they confirmed their original dissent by publishing their "Judicial Testimony," which is regarded as the authoritative exposition of Secession principles. Their numbers were now increased by the addition of other four ministers,—Mair of Orwell, Nairn of Abbotshall, Thomson of Burntisland, and Ralph Erskine of Dunfermline, the younger brother of Ebenezer. The little "Presbytery" of eight ministers expanded in 1744 into "The Associate Synod," and, further to complete their independence, they appointed a professor of divinity to educate their own men for the ministry.

Anomalous as their position was, the Seceders still

kept possession of the parish churches and drew their stipends. The Assembly was patient in its altered mood, and winked at the irregularity, still hopeful of the dissenters' return. Patience at last exhausted, they were summoned before the Assembly in 1739. They appeared at the bar as a duly constituted presbytery, with a moderator at their head, who read an elaborate repudiation of the Assembly's authority, heaping much abuse upon that venerable body. Although the libel against the Seceders was found proved, still another year's grace was given them to reflect and return. In the following year the Seceders were again summoned before the Assembly, and as they failed to appear, sentence of deposition was passed on the 15th May 1740. It was deferred until the afternoon of the term day, that the deposed ministers might receive the stipend of the preceding half-year. Thus the Assembly's sentence, like the Psalmist's song, was a mingling of mercy with judgment.¹

The Seceders, shortly after their ejection from the Established Church, received a visit from George Whitfield, who was then at the height of his popularity as a preacher. He had been one of the little Methodist society in Oxford along with John Wesley. But Wesley became Arminian and Whitfield Calvinistic, and so they parted. The ardent Calvinism of the Seceders had attractions for Whitfield; the Erskines corresponded with him, and in July 1741 he came to Dunfermline and preached in Ralph Erskine's church. Excepting their Calvinism there was little in common between the Seceders and their guest. They argued with him against Episcopacy and Independency, and Whitfield replied that

¹ *Acts of Assembly*, pp. 649-654, and *Acts and Testimony of the Associate Synod*, p. 222; Morren's

Annals, i. 5, 6; Struthers, ii. 42-53; M'Kerrow, pp. 126-138.

Church government was a matter of indifference to him.¹ When they questioned him on the Solemn League and Covenant, he said that he had been too busy with matters of greater importance; whereupon they assured him that every pin of the tabernacle was precious. When they sought to keep the preacher all to themselves, Whitfield asked, "Why confine my preaching to you?" "Because we are the Lord's people," said Ralph Erskine. "And are there no other Lord's people but you?" asked Whitfield; "and supposing all other people are the devil's people, certainly they have the more need to be preached to. I am therefore," he continued, "more and more determined to go out to the highways and hedges, and if the Pope himself will lend me his pulpit I will gladly proclaim the righteousness of Christ therein." The inevitable rupture followed. "I retired," says Whitfield, "I wept, I prayed, and, after preaching in the open fields I sat and dined with them, and then took a final farewell." Whitfield afterwards preached in parish churches and in the open air to crowds eager to hear him, while the Seceders were denouncing him as an agent of the devil.²

In the summer of 1742 Whitfield returned to Scotland and took part in the revival at Cambuslang, originated by Mr. M'Culloch, the parish minister. The excitement culminated on a Sunday in August, when about thirty thousand people were collected on what is still known as "Conversion Brae." They were divided into three congregations, and twenty-five tables were prepared for communicants, who were served by numerous ministers. Whitfield rose at ten o'clock at night to address the

¹ Whitfield called himself "a moderate Catholic clergyman of the Church of England."—Gledstone's

Whitfield, p. 496.

² *Scots Magazine*, July 1741.

multitude amid excitement such as he had never before witnessed. He preached for an hour and a half; and thousands, he says, were bathed in tears, sobbing and weeping over a pierced Saviour. After this Whitfield returned to England, the revival fervour cooled, and criticism of the "Cambuslang wark" set in. The Seceders condemned "the awful work" as a "delusion," and the Cameronians, or M'Millanites, denounced it in a public declaration, in which Whitfield is called "an abjured prelatie hireling advancing the kingdom of Satan."¹

The contemporary annals of Episcopacy record the deaths of bishops Duncan, Gadderar, Rose, and Lumsden, all in the first half of the year 1733. Gadderar was the only prelate of any distinction among the four. An excellent administrator, a man of sound judgment and independent spirit, he was every way worthy of his office. In happier circumstances than those of the Episcopal Church at that time—persecuted by the State, distracted by intestine factions—Gadderar might have been a power in its resuscitation. He was not more strenuous in fighting for the primitive "Usages" than for the spiritual independence and freedom of the Church. Singular also was his tact in combining the bishops who cared only for the Usages with the College bishops who opposed both diocesan administration and the Usages. From his former residence in London and association with the English non-jurors, he took a larger and more spiritual view of the Church and of the episcopate. In spite of difficulties he did good service in reintroducing diocesan Episcopacy, in elevating the tone and efficiency of the Church, and arresting her spiritual declension. His

¹ Burton, viii. 413, 414; Struthers, ii. 59-72; M'Kerrow, pp. 150-171; H. M. Wellwood's *Life of John Erskine*, p. 110; Chambers, *Dom. Annals*, iii. 606-608. Gledstone's *Whitfield*, p. 292; Sir

friends paid him what honour they could by laying his body within the ancient cathedral of his see in the grave of bishop Scougal.¹

Bishops were elected by the clergy for all the vacant districts except Glasgow. Bishop Dunbar succeeded Gadderar, Keith was elected to Fife, while still residing in Edinburgh, and the primus, Freebairn, was made bishop of Edinburgh. On bishop Gillan's death, in 1735, the clergy of Dunblane elected Robert White, presbyter at Cupar Fife. The primus, under the influence of the Chevalier, refused to confirm the election, but bishops Rattray, Dunbar, and Keith, notwithstanding his disapproval, consecrated the bishop-elect. This made a fresh rupture between the rival episcopal schools, which was only terminated by the death of Freebairn in December 1739.

The clergy of Edinburgh made several applications for a mandate to elect a successor to Freebairn, but the bishops were unwilling to grant it, the real but unacknowledged reason being that the Chevalier had, after the concordat of 1731, forbidden any nominations to the two metropolitan sees and to the see of Edinburgh. Affairs were now at a deadlock. Rattray, the new primus, failed to vindicate once and for all the principle of spiritual independence. Had he and his brother prelates stood firm on this occasion the usurpation of James would have troubled the Church no more.²

Appointments were made from time to time to other sees not reserved by royal prerogative. William Falconer, presbyter at Forres, became coadjutor to Bishop Keith in Caithness and Orkney in 1741; and next year, on the

¹ Skinner, ii. 648, and Lawson, *Memoirs of Episc. Ch. in Scot.* pp. 523.

² Skinner, ii. 648, 649; MS.

17-22; Lawson, pp. 533, 534.

death of Ochterlonie, the last of the College bishops, James Rait, presbyter in Dundee, was elected by the clergy of Brechin as his successor. The Edinburgh clergy, wearied by long delay, asked bishop Rattray, in 1743, to take temporary charge of the diocese. He expressed his consent, but was taken ill and died in Edinburgh on Ascension Day, the 12th May, in the sixtieth year of his age. Rattray's death was a severe loss to the episcopate and to the Church. His exemplary life was a model to clergy and people, and his learning added lustre to his office. He was a pioneer in the school of liturgiology, and the author, among other works, of *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem, being the Liturgy of St. James, compared with the Liturgy of St. Cyril and with the Clementine*. This work is still highly esteemed, even after all that has been done by modern liturgical scholars. Rattray had his weaknesses, and they are obvious to the student of the times. As a diocesan bishop, opposed in principle to the political thralldom of the Church, he failed to vindicate her spiritual autonomy. As a presbyter he had been the boldest champion of the rights of his order; when he became a bishop he apparently forgot that he had once been a presbyter. He was succeeded in the diocese of Dunkeld by John Alexander, presbyter at Alloa, who was consecrated at Edinburgh in August 1743. The office of primus was conferred upon bishop Keith.

At an Episcopal synod held in Edinburgh after bishop Alexander's consecration, a code of sixteen canons was framed for the government of the Church. Rattray had prepared the first ten, and the rest were added by the other bishops. The preamble runs—"The bishops of the Church of Scotland being now, by the good providence of God, perfectly united in one and the same mind, and

the concordates, that were formed while some unhappy differences subsisted amongst them, thereby vacated, they have unanimously agreed to establish the following canons for the future regulation of the government of this Church." The canons deal with the election of bishops, the appointment and powers of the primus, who had no metropolitanical authority, and the rights of presbyters in choosing their bishop. Each bishop was to appoint a dean, and the deans as representing the presbyters were to sit in all synodical meetings, "to propose and reason in all matters of discipline and grievances of presbyters, but not to give any decisive voice." Severe measures, including excommunication, were to be taken against any presbyter exercising his office after deposition; clergy countenancing his schismatical action were to be suspended, and laity doing the same were to be debarred from communion. The bishops in synod also passed a strong recommendation in favour of the Scottish Liturgy for the celebration of Holy Communion, and of the use of a liturgy in other rites of the Church. Confirmation, which had been greatly neglected, was now to be insisted upon.

There is little in this elementary code of canons that calls for special remark. The canonical rights of presbyters were limited to the election of their bishop. Once elected, bishops might impose canons of any number and character upon the Church and misgovern it, as they had been doing to the verge of its extinction, without let or hindrance.¹

There had been no attempt to provide the Episcopal Church with a code of canons since the abortive effort of Charles I. in 1636. That venture miscarried, largely, as

¹ The censure of excommunication appearing in these canons was a survival from the past, and shows that prelates could follow in the wake of Presbyterians and Papists.

has been shown, from the arbitrary method in which the canons were imposed. The Scottish bishops, in legislating for the Church without consulting the clergy who were specially affected by their legislation, were not much wiser now than the impolitic king. Perhaps the best that can be said for them is that they were the victims of a mischievous tradition which they had not the wisdom to discard.

The Edinburgh presbyters, who took the lead among the Scottish clergy, soon apprised the bishops of their mistake. At a meeting in January 1744, ostensibly for the election of a dean—which was in their hands during the vacancy of the see—they took up and discussed the code of canons. They sent a letter to the bishops, signed by seventeen of their number, remonstrating against several of the canons, and still more against the manner of their introduction. They claimed a right to share in all ecclesiastical legislation, and remonstrated against the enactment of canons “by any one of the Church’s constituent parts.” They pleaded that “by the constitution of the Episcopal Church of Scotland the presbyters did sit in synods and church assemblies with their bishops, not barely to hear and propose, but to reason and represent ; that they had authoritative voices, and voted decisively, in whatsoever question came before them.” In conclusion, they begged the bishops to consider “the fatal consequence” of their isolated action.

The bishops resented the tone of the letter, and made no answer. The Edinburgh clergy represented their case again in July, and still the bishops kept silence. In December the presbyters made the following proposals to the bishops in the interests of peace—(1) that the bishops should annul their recent canons, and that no new ones should be made without competent authority ; (2) that the

concordat of 1731 as to the use of the Scottish or English Liturgy should be more strictly observed, without additions or omissions in either office ; (3) that the bishops should be obliged to consecrate the person elected by the presbyters as their bishop unless they had relevant objections to his faith or morals, the objections to be stated in a canonical manner ; (4) that the diocesan districts should be as in the concordat, or reduced to six or seven ; (5) that in conferring holy orders and in exercising discipline the bishops should have the concurrence of the presbyters.¹ This brought a reply from the primus, 25th January 1745, to the effect that no decision could be given until the bishops met in synod. Before any meeting was held the country was in the throes of another dynastic insurrection.

In regard to the Liturgies referred to in this address it may be mentioned that, previous to the concordat of 1731, the English Prayer Book was in general use in the daily service. Several editions of the Scottish Communion Office had also been printed and were extensively used. At the date of the address (1744) the great majority of the clergy, outside of the diocese of Edinburgh, used the Scottish Office in celebrating, but with various interpolations at will. Bishop Keith states that at this time there were not five presbyters in the whole Church, exclusive of the Edinburgh diocese, who celebrated by the English Office.²

While the Episcopal Church had improved her order of worship since disestablishment, the numbers of her clergy and people had steadily diminished. Fifty-five years of persecution and dissension had reduced the clergy from nearly a thousand to not more than a hundred and thirty in communion with the Scottish bishops ; and the political events of the next fifty years made a further

¹ The proposals are stated here in summary. See Grub, iv. 30.

² Grub, iv. 24-28 ; Skinner, ii. 647, 648.

reduction. The numbers of the laity must have decreased from the same causes, if not in the same proportion. It was impossible for the clergy when the penal statutes of 1719 were first enforced to minister openly to the congregations, and being left without religious ordinances many of her people gradually drifted into the Established Church. A majority of the nobility and gentry still adhered to their ancestral principles, and in some districts of the north and of the Highlands a majority also of the other classes continued Episcopalians.¹

The Roman Catholics were subject in the exercise of their religion to similar penalties still more rigorously enforced. But no rigours restrained the ministrations of the bishops and priests to their scattered flock, not even imprisonment and exile. In 1731 Propaganda appointed Hugh M'Donald, son of the laird of Morar, to be coadjutor bishop, and he was consecrated privately in Edinburgh by bishops Gordon and Wallace assisted by a priest.² Next year, by a decree of Propaganda Scotland was divided into two vicariates—Highland and Lowland. The Highland district was assigned to bishop M'Donald, and bishop Gordon, on the death of his coadjutor, received another in the person of Alexander Smith, consecrated in 1735. Bishop M'Donald was brought into prominence in the rising of 1745, when the standard of prince Charles was unfurled at Glenfinnan, in Moidart. He gave it his solemn benediction, and appointed a number of his clergy chaplains to the prince's army, although he disapproved of the expedition, and had advised Charles of its hopelessness owing to the want of adequate preparation.³

¹ Lawson, p. 534, and Bishop Keith's letter cited by Grub, iv. 32.

² Bishop Wallace, as has been mentioned, was consecrated by bishop Gordon and two priests—thus pre-

serving the number three in the consecration, though not all of the Episcopal order.

³ Bellesheim, iv. 189, 190, and Appendix xiii.

The Roman mission in Scotland was not more free from clerical dissension than the other religious communities. Jansenism pervaded the Scots college at Paris in which several of the Scottish missionaries were educated, and the little seminary at Scalán, the nursery of the native priesthood, in the wilds of Glenlivet, had also become indoctrinated with Jansenistic ideas. By a papal bull five propositions in Jansen's writings had been condemned as erroneous, and bishop Gordon in 1733 drew up a formula which every priest, secular and regular, was required to subscribe as a safeguard against Jansenism. Many of the clergy declined the formula. They had drunk of the Jansenistic well in Paris, and Father Thomas Innes, prefect of the Scots college in that city, was accused of having poisoned the waters.¹ Even bishops Gordon and Smith were suspected of favouring the heresy. The result was the formation of two schools in the Scottish mission—the Paris school tainted with Jansenism, and the Roman school, headed by bishop M'Donald, reputed to be orthodox.²

The enterprise of prince Charles Edward, though ill planned and weakly executed, was not without some chance of success. The prince's personal appearance and manners made him as popular in Scotland as his father, "the Old Chevalier," had been the reverse.³ The Union

¹ Innes was a learned Scot, author of *The Critical Essay* and *The Civil and Ecclesiastical History*. He died at Paris in 1744 at the age of eighty-two.

² Bellesheim, iv. 200-211 and 408-413; Grub, iii. 344; and *Historians of Scotland*, vol. viii., preface to Innes's Essay by Dr. Grub, pp. xiii.-xxx. Cornelius Jansen was bishop of Ypres from 1636 to 1638, where he died of the plague just as he finished the great work on which he had been engaged for many years. The Jesuits were the main instru-

ments in the condemnation of Jansenism. Pascal, Fenelon, Quesnel, and the Port Royal School, were reputed Jansenists. The Jansenistic Church of Holland, which has existed for nearly two hundred years, was the result of the vacillating policy of the papal court. From that Church the "Old Catholics" received their Episcopal succession. See article "Jansenists," Benham's *Dictionary of Religion*, pp. 567-570.

³ The father lived until January 1766.

with England was still unpopular among the Scottish people, and many of them had no great liking for the Hanoverian sovereign. Edinburgh became wildly Jacobite, and the prince and his Highland army took easy possession of the capital. The victory at Prestonpans, in September 1745, raised the spirit of the Jacobites to the pitch of enthusiasm. Thenceforth, however, there was little but disappointment and disaster. The prince's army marched through England and reached Derby, and then marched back. On the 16th April 1746 they were utterly routed by the duke of Cumberland on Culloden moor, near Inverness. The barbarities perpetrated by the victorious army upon their hapless prisoners covered the victors with disgrace, and not least their commander, who left a name long execrated in Scotland.¹

Many of the Episcopal chapels, which were numerous between the rivers Tay and Spey, were burnt by the duke's orders on the march of his army to the north. The burning of the chapels was the prelude to persecution of the Episcopalians, clergy and laity. While the Episcopalians were nearly all Jacobites at heart, they had not openly committed themselves as a body to the insurrection of 1745 as they had done in 1715.² The persecution which followed was therefore levelled at their religion as much as at their disloyalty. In the summer of 1746 Parliament passed "An Act more effectually to prohibit and prevent pastors or ministers from officiating in Episcopal meeting-houses in Scotland, without duly qualifying themselves according to law; and to punish persons for resorting to any meeting-houses where such unqualified pastors or ministers

¹ "The Hanoverian army and the duke of Cumberland displayed a barbarity which recalled the memory of Sedgemoor and of the Bloody Assize." Lecky, *Hist. of England in Eighteenth Century*, i. 423.

² Only two Episcopal clergymen—Mr. Lyon of Perth and Mr. M'Lauchlan—followed the army of prince Charles, and both were afterwards executed. For Mr. Lyon see Canon Farquhar's *History of Perth*.

shall officiate." Every clergyman then officiating in an Episcopal congregation was required to qualify, by presenting his letters of orders and taking the oaths, before the 1st September 1746. Failing this he was forbidden to officiate in any meeting-house under penalty of, for the first offence, six months' imprisonment, and for the second, banishment for life to the plantations of America. Every place in which five or more persons assembled for worship was declared to be a meeting-house. For the first time, the laity were included in the penal statutes. Any layman attending an illegal meeting-house, and not giving information of the same within five days, was liable to be fined and imprisoned. If a peer were twice guilty of the offence, he could neither be chosen a representative peer nor could he vote in the election of another; and in like case a commoner could not be a member of Parliament for shire or burgh, nor a magistrate or councillor of any burgh, nor could he exercise the franchise. The ninth section of the Act aimed at the extirpation of the native priesthood by enacting that after the 1st September no letters of orders should be deemed sufficient to enable a clergyman to qualify, but such as had been given by some bishop of the Church of England or of Ireland.¹

It is believed that only five Episcopal clergymen qualified under the statute;² and two of the five, John Skinner of Longside, the ecclesiastical historian, and Livingstone of Deer, afterwards joined their non-juring brethren. The public ministrations of bishops and presbyters were proscribed after the 1st September 1746, and, so far as an Act of Parliament could do it, the Episcopal Church was virtually annihilated in Scotland. Charles the Second and the duke of Lauderdale never attempted

¹ Act cited by Thomas Stephen, *Linshart*, p. 46; Thomas Stephen, *History*, iv. 327-329.

² See Walker's *John Skinner of*

History, iv. 326.

more tyrannical measures with the Covenanters. Had the Episcopalians, instead of scrupulously adhering to their doctrine of non-resistance, met persecution by arms, as the Covenanters did, Scotland would have heard more of their wrongs and suffering. As it was, they preferred to suffer in silence, ready to draw the sword and fight for their earthly sovereign, but as resolute to sheath it when called upon to suffer for their religion. For Christ's kingdom they believed such warfare to be forbidden. Many ingenious devices the clergy adopted to keep within the letter of the law while ministering to their people, such as reading the service in one place, with the statutory five persons present, but within hearing of a larger number ; or, when the weather permitted, meeting in secluded places in the open air. Occasionally the letter of the law was broken and the offenders caught in the transgression, for every presbytery had its spies where Episcopalians were numerous, and in such cases imprisonment of the offending clergy followed.¹

The government, not satisfied with the penal laws of 1746, passed a more stringent Act in 1748 which violated the consciences of the native Episcopalians by disqualifying their clergy and proscribing their religion. By this Act the registration of orders from a Scottish bishop, although already made, was declared null and void after the 29th September. The English bishops opposed the bill in the House of Lords, and several of them spoke against it. Notwithstanding the opposition of the Episcopal bench the bill was passed by a majority of thirty - seven to thirty-two.²

The penalties for the infringement of this Act, as for

¹ MS. Memoirs of the Episcopal Ch. in Scotland, pp. 30-32 ; *Scots Magazine*, viii. 446, ix. 608, x. 150, cited by Grub, iv. 37 ; Skinner's

History, ii. 663.

² *Parliamentary History*, xiv. 269-315 ; *Scots Magazine*, x. 589-596, xi. 21-37, cited by Grub, iv. 40.

that of 1746, were for the first offence imprisonment for six months, and for the second "transportation to some of his majesty's plantations for life." And these penalties were no dead letter. In 1753 John Skinner, of Longside, was imprisoned for six months in Old Aberdeen for having officiated to more than the statutory number; and John Connochar, a Highland clergyman, was in 1755 apprehended at Inveraray, and received sentence of perpetual banishment from Scotland for having celebrated marriages contrary to a statute of Charles II.¹ In the winter of 1748-49 Mr. Greig, clergyman at Stonehaven, was imprisoned in the town's tolbooth, and two neighbouring clergy, Petrie of Drumlithie, and Troup of Muchalls, shared the same cell.²

The Roman Catholics suffered still more severely from penal laws after 1746. More than a thousand of them were transported to America; their chapels were destroyed, and the seminary at Scalán burned, with its missals and vestments. Bishop M'Donald, from his prominence during the insurrection, had to leave the country,³ and several of the priests followed him into exile, while others were detained in prison or in ships of war. When the aged bishop Gordon died in 1746, his coadjutor, bishop Smith, was left for a time the sole head of the Roman mission. In this reign of terror many of the Roman clergy remained in concealment to avoid persecution. To assist bishop Smith in his duties James Grant, student of the Scots

¹ There was a political nemesis in this sentence, the penal clause of the Act being framed on one originally aimed at the outed Presbyterian ministers. *Scots Magazine*, xvii. 207, 209, 313-316; Arnot's *Criminal Trials*, pp. 339-343, and *Life of John Skinner*, prefixed to his *Theological Works*, pp. xi. and xii.; Walker's *John Skinner of Linshart*, chap. iii.

² Their bodies rest side by side in the old kirkyard of St. Mary's, Cowie. See Thos. Stephen, iv. 337, 338; Walker's *Memoirs of Bishop Jolly*, p. 18.

³ He returned in 1749 under the name of Mr. Brown, and continued his ministrations in secret until apprehended in 1755.

college, Paris, was consecrated coadjutor by that prelate at Edinburgh in November 1755. Grant had been a prisoner in Inverness for upwards of a year after Culloden, and was liberated in 1747. He accepted with reluctance an office which in those times, while it conferred double honour, exposed him to more than double danger.¹

In returning to the "Seceders" we find them quarrelling among themselves over the Burgess oath. In a clause of this oath the burgess had to swear—"I profess and allow with my heart the true religion presently professed within this realm and authorised by the laws thereof." One section interpreted the oath as sanctioning the corrupt Establishment from which they had separated; the other, headed by the Erskines, understood by "the true religion," the religion which they themselves professed, and made no scruples about the oath. In the Associate Synod of April 1746 the majority condemned the oath, and ordered all who had taken it to submit to this judgment of the synod. The minority, who formed nearly half the synod, protested and separated. The result was the formation of the Burgher and Anti-Burgher synods. In April 1748 the Anti-Burghers summoned their Burgher brethren to their synod, and as they failed to compear they were suspended from the ministry, and afterwards deposed and excommunicated. Among those excommunicated were Ebenezer Erskine and his brother Ralph. Neither of them long outlived this unhappy dispute. Ralph died in 1752 and Ebenezer in 1754. "And is Ralph gone?" said Ebenezer on hearing of his brother's death; "he has twice got the start of me; he was first in Christ, and now he is first in glory." With all their narrowness and factiousness we

¹ See Bellesheim, iv. 192-200, and Appendix, pp. 392, 394, containing report of the three bishops to

Propaganda, dated Edinburgh, 20th November 1755.

must acknowledge the sturdy integrity and fervent piety of the founders of the Seceders.¹

It was at this period that John Wesley first visited Scotland. His Arminian opinions and Methodist practices both told against his success among the Presbyterians. His preaching attracted large crowds, at least on Sundays, but he failed to make any lasting impression on the people, or to convert them to the Methodist society he was forming. Whitfield gave Wesley his impression of the Scots, and especially of the Seceders. Wesley formed the same opinion from his own experience, both of the strength and the weakness of the Scottish character. He complained specially of the narrowness and bigotry of the Seceders. "I have not yet," he said, "met a Papist in this kingdom who would tell me to my face that all but themselves must be damned; but I have seen Seceders enough who make no scruple to affirm that none but themselves could be saved." He was much pained in travelling through Scotland to witness the havoc that the Reformers had made in the ecclesiastical buildings. Standing among the ruins of Arbroath abbey, he exclaimed, "God deliver us from reforming mobs." "I know," he observed, "it is commonly said the work to be done needed such a spirit. Not so; the work of God does not, cannot need the work of the devil to forward it." He frequently worshipped with the Episcopalians in their chapels, and was drawn to them by the decorum of their worship, which he praised as exceeding anything he had seen in England. One day, after attending an Episcopal chapel in Glasgow, he expressed his preference for a liturgic service by saying—"No man having tasted old wine straightway desireth new, for he saith the old is better." Wesley visited Scot-

¹ Struthers, ii. 560-563; M'Kerrow, pp. 208-238, 511-521; Gib's *Display*, ii. 17-100.

land on various occasions and, contrary to his professed principles, formed separate Methodist congregations, but neither then nor afterwards did Wesleyanism take any firm hold in Scotland ; and the congregations, except in large towns, have had a struggling and precarious existence.¹

During the Seceders' strife the Established Church was moving Parliament for an augmentation of stipends. These averaged no more than £52, and were confessedly inadequate for the decent maintenance of the ministry. The attempt to raise the stipends cost Charles the First the lasting hostility of the landholders of his day. Times had changed since then, but the spirit of the landholders had not. Such of them as attended the Assembly gave the proposal their determined opposition when it was brought up, in 1749, by overtures from numerous presbyteries and synods. Next year it was resolved by the Assembly to petition Parliament for an augmentation. Immediately the heritors in the different counties passed resolutions against any increase of the stipends. And this was done "not by the Jacobite gentry only, but by men who were elders in the Church, who sat in her Assemblies, and made speeches about their devotion to her cause."² So powerful was their opposition that the application to Parliament proved fruitless, and the landholders were for the time left in undisturbed possession of the teinds.³

Patronage still disturbed the peace of the Establishment and deepened the antagonism between the Moderates and the popular party. In the ten years, from 1740 to 1750, there were no fewer than fifty disputed settlements before the Assembly. Highland and Lowland parishes were alike the scenes of contending factions, and some

¹ Southey's *Life of Wesley*, ii. 135-146.

² Cunningham, ii. 483.

³ Morren's *Annals*, i. 115 seq.; Struthers, ii. 570-575; M'Kerrow, pp. 249-251.

parishes remained vacant for years. A dispute in Lanark went from the Assembly to the Court of Session, and thence to the House of Lords. In Inverkeithing the opposition to a presentee in 1751 was so violent that the presbytery of Dunfermline refused to induct him. The Assembly next year sought to compel the presbytery. They still objected, and six of them appeared at its bar with a "Humble Representation," in which they justified their conduct. By a majority of 93 to 65 it was resolved to depose one of the recalcitrant ministers. The lot fell upon Thomas Gillespie, minister of Carnock, one of the gentlest of men. When sentence of deposition was passed he meekly said, "Moderator, I desire to receive this sentence of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, pronounced against me, with real concern and awful impressions of the divine conduct in it; but I rejoice that to me it is given on behalf of Christ, not only to believe on Him, but to suffer for His sake." The Moderates had carried their point, but at the cost of another schism. Gillespie continued to preach in a meeting-house provided for him in Dunfermline. In 1761 he, with other two ministers, Colier of Kilconquhar, and Thomas Boston of Jedburgh, son of Boston of Ettrick, founded the Presbytery of Relief, the fourth secession from the Established Church within seventy years.¹

After its hard measure to Gillespie the Assembly's attention was drawn in a new direction. David Hume, the philosopher and historian, had been issuing his sceptical treatises for some years—the first appeared in 1738 when he was only twenty-seven—in which he attacked the fundamental truths of Christianity. In his Essay on

¹ See Table at end of this chapter. Struthers, ii. 575-604; M'Kerrow, *Acts of Assembly*, pp. 707-711; pp. 244-249; Dr. Carlyle's *Autobiography*, pp. 255, 256, 271. Morren's *Annals*, i. 267-279;

Miracles, which made the greatest sensation, he attempted to prove the impossibility of miracle by arguing that "no testimony is sufficient to establish a miracle, unless the testimony be of such a kind that its falsehood would be more miraculous than the fact which it endeavours to establish." This line of argument was ably answered later by principal Campbell of Aberdeen in his *Dissertation on the Miracles*; meanwhile there raged the usual war of pamphlets. The controversy was complicated by the appearance of another sceptical author, Henry Home, afterwards lord Kames, who published in 1751 his *Essays on the Principles of Morality and Natural Religion*.¹ The writings of both authors were brought before the Assemblies of 1755 and 1756. Lord Kames was an elder of the Church and therefore subject to the discipline of its courts, but the Assembly shrank from censuring a member of the judicial bench. About David Hume they had no such scruple, and the popular party prepared for his excommunication. The Moderates with more wisdom argued that Hume, not being a member of the Church, was outwith their jurisdiction, and that to put his writings on an *Index Expurgatorius* would only serve to advertise them. Gamaliel's advice prevailed. Both authors were let alone, and the Assembly contented itself with expressing in a resolution its "just abhorrence of any principles tending to infidelity."²

The Assembly was in trouble next year through another literary venture, not philosophic but dramatic. John Home, minister of Athelstaneford, had written the drama of *Douglas*, and in December 1756 it was performed at the theatre in Carrubber's Close, Edinburgh, in

¹ Home was made a Senator of the College of Justice in 1752, and assumed the title of lord Kames.

² *Acts of Assembly*, p. 721:

Morren's *Annals*, ii. 54-58, 86-92; Carlyle's *Autobiography*, pp. 272-285.

presence of the author, of Dr. Carlyle, and several other ministers. Puritan feeling, though no longer in the ascendant, was yet sufficiently strong to put its ban upon the theatre. Not many years before it had compelled Allan Ramsay to close the same theatre.¹ Several presbyteries at once took action against Home and his clerical supporters, and dealt with theatre-going as an ecclesiastical offence. When the storm rose, Home escaped censure only by resigning his parish. Carlyle was served with a libel, but escaped with a reprimand; the Edinburgh presbytery suspended Mr. White, minister of Liberton, and others were rebuked by their presbyteries. The Assembly of 1757 confirmed the action of the lower courts by passing an overture that "none of the ministers of this Church do, upon any occasion, attend a theatre." It was at first intended to have included laymen within the prohibition, but on reconsideration, their liberty was not abridged. While much of the puritanic zeal and narrowness had passed into the ranks of dissent, this incident shows that there still remained within the Establishment some savour of the old puritan leaven.²


The turmoil, political and ecclesiastical, in the reign of George II., was not favourable to the growth of personal religion among the people; and the spirit of the age, already so different from that of the Covenants, or even of the Revolution, while more refined by learning and culture, was less influenced by evangelical truth. The

¹ Burton, viii. 551.

² *Acts of Assembly*, p. 729; Morren's *Annals*, ii. 112-129; Carlyle's *Autobiography*, pp. 310-325. Carlyle says that after the theatrical storm blew over "the more distant clergy returned to their usual amusement in the theatre when occasionally in town." He adds that, "in the year 1784, when the

great actress, Mrs. Siddons, first appeared in Edinburgh, during the sitting of the General Assembly, that court was obliged to fix all its important business for the alternate days when she did not act, as all the younger members, clergy as well as laity, took their stations in the theatre on those days by three in the afternoon."

age, however, was not destitute of good men. No finer example of the Christian character could be found than that of Alexander Forbes—lord Pitsligo. When he joined the army of prince Charles in the '45 it was remarked by one who was present that "it seemed as if religion, virtue, and justice were entering the camp under the appearance of this venerable old man." And if he may be taken as a representative of Episcopalian piety, his namesake, the lord president Forbes of Culloden, represents with equal honour the Presbyterian side of religion and politics. Again, whatever may be thought of the narrow theology of ministers like Thomas Boston, the Erskines, and the gentle Gillespie, the earnestness and sincerity of the men cannot be questioned. Nor can we in equity overlook that other "suffering remnant," the persecuted Roman Catholics, whose bishops and priests, with equal zeal and still more abounding sacrifice, braved so many perils to minister to the scattered flocks who were, like themselves, true to the faith of their fathers.



CHAPTER XXIV

GEORGE III.—FROM BEGINNING OF HIS REIGN, 1760, TO REPEAL OF PENAL STATUTES, 1792

Episcopal worship and administration under persecution—Penal statutes not rigidly enforced under George III.—Elections of bishops—Primus Falconer succeeded by Kilgour with John Skinner as coadjutor—The Scottish Communion Office—Literary activity in the Universities, *e.g.* Principals Robertson and Campbell, Professors Reid, Beattie, Blair, etc.—Grievance of patronage in the Established Church—Disputed settlements of ministers—Creed subscription questioned—Opposition of Presbyterians to Roman Catholic Relief Bill—Bishop Hay leader of Romanists—Suppression of Jesuit Order in 1773—Disabilities of Romanists in Scotland—Attempt to relieve them frustrated by Scottish fanaticism—Burke's criticism thereon—Robertson's retiral from Church affairs in 1780—The "Buchanites"—Consecration of bishop Seabury, 1784—Primus Skinner—Bishop Abernethy Drummond—Heresy of Dr. M'Gill—Seceders condemn Erastian Establishment and sound first note of Voluntaryism—Death of Charles Edward, 1788—Episcopalians transfer allegiance to Hanoverian dynasty and seek relief from penal statutes—Relief Bill in 1792—Effects of a century's persecution on Episcopal Church.

GEORGE THE SECOND died 25th October 1760, and was succeeded by his grandson, George the Third, the first native sovereign of the Hanoverian line. The young king was more favourably disposed than his two predecessors to the Scottish Episcopalians, and as he gave no indication of enforcing the penal laws the clergy resumed their duties more openly, and their congregations ventured to erect humble chapels in many places. Their

worship had now been proscribed for nearly fifty years, and the effects were visible, not only in their diminished numbers, but in the disuse of the more reverent ritual which they had adopted since their deliverance from State trammels. The bishops, though nominally responsible for decency and order in the conduct of the services, could not in their enforced seclusion exercise much supervision over the clergy, each of whom, under the stress of isolation and persecution, became a law unto himself in his ministrations. The result was more variety than uniformity, with very little regard to beauty or solemnity of worship. The irregularities continued until the next century, when the synod of 1811 ordered a strict adherence to the English Prayer Book in the Morning and Evening Service.

The annals of Episcopacy for the rest of the century make but a sombre chronicle, with only a few noteworthy incidents to relieve the gloom as the promise of a brighter day. But even in the darkest days the bishops never failed, as their predecessors had done in the previous century, to keep up the succession of their order. Their action must have been largely prompted by the conviction that the cause for which they witnessed—"Evangelical Truth, Apostolic Order"—had a future before it in Scotland. If less is known than could be wished of the state of the Episcopal clergy and their congregations during this period, the blank in the record is partly attributable to the bishops' exclusive system of administration, and partly to the secrecy which persecution imposed upon all Episcopal ministrations.

Bishop White, the primus, died in 1761, and was succeeded in the primacy by William Falconer, bishop of Moray, and in the district of Fife by his coadjutor bishop Edgar. Robert Forbes, presbyter at Leith, was

next year made bishop of Ross and Caithness. On the death of bishop Gerard, of Aberdeen, in October 1767, the clergy of that district elected bishop Forbes, but the Episcopal college refused to confirm the election, and Robert Kilgour, presbyter at Peterhead, became Gerard's successor in the see of Aberdeen. Charles Rose, presbyter at Doune, became bishop of Dunblane in 1774; Arthur Petrie, presbyter at Folla, was chosen coadjutor to the primus in 1776; and George Innes, presbyter at Aberdeen, was made bishop of Brechin in 1778. On the death of bishop Forbes, bishop Petrie was collated to the sees of Ross and Caithness in 1777. It illustrates the success of persecution in these northern dioceses, where Episcopacy was strong enough at the Revolution to resist the induction of Presbyterian ministers, that but one Episcopal clergyman was found there now—Allan Cameron, at Arpafelie.¹

In 1776 the see of Edinburgh, after a vacancy of thirty-seven years, was filled by the primus Falconer, whose usual residence was in that city, and his diocese of Moray thereupon fell to bishop Petrie's charge. When Falconer resigned the primacy from infirmities of age in 1782,² bishop Kilgour was elected by the bishops as their primus, and John Skinner, presbyter at Aberdeen, was consecrated as his coadjutor. In all these cases the presbyters exercised their suffrage in the election of their chief pastors, and the act of consecration was performed by the canonical number of three bishops, and according to the ordinal of the English Prayer Book.³

¹ Cameron had charge of all Ross-shire and part of Inverness-shire. See *Scot. Guardian*, March 1866.

² For bishop Falconer see Boswell's *Letters*, *Life of Dr. Johnson*, iii. 251, 252.

³ Register of the College of Bishops, i. 21-32; Keith's *Catalogue*, pp. 540-

545; Skinner, ii. 683 and 697; *Scots Magazine*, xxxvii. 638, and xlv. 697; Lawson, pp. 321, 322; Skinner's *Primitive Truth and Order*, p. 353; Thos. Stephen, iv. 377-395; Neale's *Life of Bishop Torry*, p. 57; Grub, iv. 87-91.

The Episcopal Church, during the years in which her religion was proscribed, enriched her liturgic worship by the compilation and adoption of the Scottish Communion Office based on that of the Prayer Book of 1637, and the English Non-juror's Office of 1718. This has ever since been her characteristic feature and her peculiar treasure. The first edition was printed in 1735; others followed in 1743 and 1755; and in 1764, under the supervision of bishops William Falconer and Robert Forbes, there was published what has been commonly accepted as the authorised edition of the Scottish Office.¹ While the Office has been said to transcend the views of its compilers it may none the less be regarded as the fittest exponent of their devotional aspirations. From its own intrinsic merits, and not less from its historic associations as the offspring of the Church in the days of her deepest depression, the Scottish Office deserves a more honourable place in its own household than recent legislation has assigned to it.

The beginning of George the Third's long reign was marked by a singular display of literary activity within the Established Church, chiefly by the professors of the Universities. In the Assembly of 1751 two young ministers on the Moderate side, both from the presbytery of Haddington, took part in a debate raised by the recusant presbyters of Inverkeithing. John Home, of Athelstaneford, moved that they should be suspended for contumacy, and William Robertson, of Gladsmuir, rose to second the motion. It was their first public appearance, and neither was then known in the field of literature. Home's tragedy of *Douglas*, and its ephemeral popularity

¹ Cheyne's *Scottish Office Vindicated*; Grub, iv. 87, and the *Annotated Scot. Com. Office*, by bishop

Dowden, pp. 97-107. The Offices of 1755 and 1764 are printed in vol. v. of Hall's *Fragmenta Liturgica*.

has already been mentioned.¹ Robertson earned a more solid and lasting reputation by his histories of Scotland, of America, and of Charles V. In 1758 he was promoted from Gladsmuir to the Greyfriars' church, Edinburgh, and next year he published his *History of Scotland*, which at once raised him to the front rank of historians.² In 1762 he became principal of the University of Edinburgh, and was soon after recognised as the leader of the Moderate party, remaining the virtual ruler of the Established Church until his voluntary retirement in 1780. The mantle of Carstares had fallen upon Robertson, and in statesmanlike ability and integrity of character he was hardly second to the diplomatic leader of the Revolution epoch. The leaders of the popular party during this period were Dr. Erskine, Robertson's colleague in the city charge, and Dr. Dick, the presentee to the parish of Lanark, whose case had been carried to the House of Lords. Among other prominent men on this side were Dr. M'Queen, Mr. Freebairn, of Dunbarton, and Mr. Stevenson, of St. Madoes.³

Aberdeen had its share of the literary men of this time, and their learning recalled old memories of the "Aberdeen Doctors" of a previous age and a different school. Principal Campbell, of Marischal college, after his reply to Hume, added to his reputation by the *Elements of Rhetoric*, and *Translations of the Gospels with Preliminary Dissertations*. His *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History*, and *Lectures on Theology* were published after his death.⁴

¹ "It called forth such admiration when put on the stage in London that a patriotic Scot is said to have asked an envious Englishman—'Whaur's your Wullie Shakespeare noo?'"—Luckock's *Ch. in Scot.* p. 305.

² Gibbon is said to have expressed the wish that in his history of Rome he might emulate Robertson in style.

³ See Cunningham, ii. 523.

⁴ His ecclesiastical lectures were published in 1801, six years after his death. The Episcopalians were surprised by a bitter attack in the lectures upon Episcopacy. Bishop Skinner answered it in his *Primitive Truth and Order*, published in 1803, a rejoinder which would have been more effective if less diffuse.

Another Aberdonian, not less eminent, was Dr. Thomas Reid, founder of the Scottish school of philosophy. His *Inquiry into the Human Mind* was written to counteract the prevalent scepticism of the time. Reid was then professor of moral philosophy in King's college, Aberdeen. His *Inquiry* was published in 1764, and in the same year he succeeded Adam Smith, author of the *Wealth of Nations*, in the chair of moral philosophy at Glasgow. Six years after the issue of Reid's work, Dr. Beattie, holding the same chair in Marischal college, published his *Essay on the Nature and Immutability of Truth*. It was written in a more popular style than Reid's great treatise, and met with immense success both in England and Scotland. The author on visiting London was received as a celebrity by its eminent men. On the strength of his literary reputation he is said to have been offered preferment in the Church of England. In the south were Dr. Hugh Blair, author of the celebrated *Sermons* and *Lectures on Rhetoric*; and Adam Ferguson, who wrote the *History of the Roman Republic*.¹

The history of the Established Church for many years to come is largely the old story of patronage, which led to disputed settlements in parishes and to heated debates in the Assembly. The Moderates, as a body, upheld the rights of the patrons, while the popular party insisted upon "a call" from the parishioners, without which no minister should be inducted. A temporary compromise was made in 1764 by the substitution of "concurrence" for call. The people were to concur in the patron's presentation to the benefice; but, whether they concurred or not, the patron's nominee had to be accepted. A com-

¹ Dr. Carlyle, speaking in the Assembly, in the year 1789, on the subject of augmentation of stipends, gave a high-flown description of this literary galaxy. See his *Autobiography*, p. 561.

mentary upon this compromise was soon supplied by the people of Kilmarnock, who resisted the induction of an unpopular minister, and made an unseemly riot.¹

Every disputed settlement naturally swelled the ranks of dissent. That door was now always open to aggrieved parishioners. In 1765 the matter was brought before the Assembly by an overture which stated that there were now in the country a hundred and twenty meeting-houses, with congregations numbering fully a hundred thousand persons that had once belonged to the Established Church. A committee on schism was appointed—the name gave much offence to the Seceders—and reported next year that the law of patronage was responsible for much of the growing dissent. The report recommended an inquiry into the number of meeting-houses, but this was rejected as savouring of espionage, and the sole issue put before the Assembly was the question of patronage. A long debate ensued, beginning at ten in the morning and lasting without intermission until eleven at night. When the vote was taken it was found that the overture was rejected by a majority of 99 to 85 votes. The Moderates had triumphed, and patronage received a new lease of life, though a chequered life, for a century.²

The Relief body, unlike the earlier Seceders, continued to cherish a warm attachment to the Established Church, as the first Wesleyans did in England, and considered themselves, while separate in the body, to be one with it in spirit. Acting on this conviction Mr. Simson, a licentiate of the presbytery of Paisley, accepted a call from certain parishioners of Bothwell who were opposed to the minister recently appointed. Simson was ordained by Gillespie and the Presbytery of Relief, and by some parish ministers he was still regarded as a brother, while

¹ Morren's *Annals*, ii. 290.

² *Ibid.* pp. 329-346.

others censured him for divisive courses. When his case came before the commission of Assembly it declared him to be no longer a licentiate of the Church. Shortly afterwards Mr. Bain, minister of the High Church of Paisley, resigned his charge and became minister of a Relief congregation in Edinburgh. In a letter to the presbytery of Paisley he assured them that "this change in his position made no change in his principles of Christian and ministerial communion." The Assembly were of a different opinion. They declared him no longer a minister of the Established Church, and forbade their ministers to hold any ministerial communion with him. Nor did the Establishment relent towards Gillespie; but the charitable man only heaped coals of fire on their head, counselling his Relief brethren, when he was dying, to seek re-union with the Church which had cast him out.¹

Several disputed settlements at this time throw a lurid light upon the popular grievance of patronage. They were the last outbursts before the agitation was lulled into a temporary sleep—a sleep which had a rude awakening in the "ten years' conflict" that preceded the disruption of 1843. In the parishes of Eaglesham and of Shotts the presbyteries were at first unable to effect the induction of the presentees in face of the rough violence of the population. A still more notorious case was that of Mr. Thomson, preferred from Gargunnoch to St. Ninians, Stirling. For seven years the people resisted his induction, until the Assembly in 1773 peremptorily ordered the presbytery to do its duty at any cost. Amidst great excitement the induction took place, and the passions of the people were not allayed by an intemperate speech from the moderator, Mr. Findlay of Dollar, who assured the presentee that "his admission could only be regarded

¹ Morren's *Annals*, ii. 292-328.

as a sinecure, and himself as a stipend-lifter, and conjured him by the most solemn appeals to withdraw from the parish. Mr. Thomson at the close of the address said—"I forgive you for what you have now said ; may God forgive you. Proceed to execute the orders of your superiors."¹

The policy of the Moderates, led by principal Robertson, was successful in allaying the agitation as to patronage. People began to realise that the law was to be enforced, and that it was hopeless to struggle against the inevitable. Dissent accordingly increased, for where the aggrieved parishioners were not strong enough to build a church and call a minister, there was generally a Secession church within easy distance. So the drift continued during the expiring years of the eighteenth century, and dissent flourished at the expense of the Establishment.

While the strife of patronage was being repressed by a strong hand, the Established Church was agitated by the question of creed subscription. The tendency of religious thought since the Revolution had been decidedly latitudinarian ; the ecclesiastical settlement savoured of this tendency and so did the dominant theology. Much of the evangelical earnestness, and what some would call the narrowness, of the age passed over with the Erskines and Gillespie into dissent. The new wine needed new bottles. Within the Establishment at this time there was considerable learning and culture among the ministers, combined with a strong flavour of rationalism. To this influence was now due the movement for a release from subscription to the Confession of Faith. Robertson, though broad in his views, as were the Moderates generally, met the proposal with his sternest opposition. He would be no party to such a radical change. The status of "the Church of

¹ Struther's *Hist.* ii. 611 ; *Scots Magazine* for 1773.

Scotland as by law established" and the statutory obligation of the Confession of Faith, both rested on the same Act of Parliament, and to clear-sighted men the difficulties in the way of abolishing subscription to the one while holding by the other, must have been obvious. The Scottish Assembly, unlike the English Convocation, has generally rejoiced in the amplest freedom to legislate for the Presbyterian Church, but its powers, large as they were, could not supersede the Act of Parliament upon which it rested. It is said that Robertson dreaded systematic attacks upon subscription from men of his own party—attacks which he believed would be successful in the long-run, and that this conviction ultimately led to his retirement.¹ So far his apprehensions have not been confirmed. The Confession of Faith still remains the statutory creed of the Scottish Establishment, though several of its doctrines, and notably its Calvinism, have been essentially modified in the practical teaching of the present day.²

In 1777 the Scottish bishops received from Robert Gordon, the last surviving prelate of the united non-jurors in England, a pathetic appeal to "provide for the spiritual comfort and security of the poor orphans of the Anti-Revolution Church in England," which he should leave behind him. It was the swan-song of the moribund non-juring body in England. The Scottish bishops returned a favourable answer, promising to take "the orphans" under their "care and tuition."³

In the same year a more numerous section of non-

¹ Stewart's *Life of Robertson*, appendix, p. 195.

² *Scots Magazine*, xxix. 175. Alterations were made in 1889 in the formula of subscription. See *Acts of Assembly* for 1889, pp. 33-36.

³ MS. Register College of Bishops, i. 27-30. Gordon died in 1779. The last bishop of the separatist non-jurors died in 1805. See *Memoirs of John Bowdler*, p. 70.

jurors—the Roman Catholics—came prominently before the public. They had suffered much, both in Britain and in Ireland, from the rigour of the penal laws. In 1777 several of these laws were repealed, so far as they affected Irish Romanists, and in the following year a similar relief was given to Romanists in England. The Bill for effecting this object had passed the House of Commons when the General Assembly met in May 1778. The Assembly was alarmed lest it should be followed by a similar measure for Scotland, and a no-popery panic, resulting in discreditable riots in Edinburgh and Glasgow, seized the populace.

The leading man in the Scoto-Roman Church at this time, and for many years to come, was bishop George Hay. He is the most conspicuous figure in the post-Reformation history of that Communion. His own history was a varied one and not without adventure. When a youth of sixteen he rendered service as a medical student to the wounded soldiers at Prestonpans, and followed the prince's army for some months. During a mild imprisonment in London he became a Roman Catholic, and, after acting for some time as a ship's surgeon, he made his way to Rome, where he studied theology for eight years in the Scots college. In April 1758 he was ordained priest, and returned to Scotland to serve the mission at Preshome in the Enzie, Banffshire. His scholarship and administrative abilities secured him the office of coadjutor to bishop Grant, to which he was consecrated at Scaln on Trinity Sunday, 1769. From this date he fixed his residence in Edinburgh, and for the next forty years no man in Scotland was more indefatigable in toil or more helpful in services to the persecuted Roman remnant. In the midst of his episcopal duties he found leisure to write the *Scripture Doctrine of Miracles*,

a work suggested by the Hume controversy,¹ and a devotional treatise, *The Sincere Christian*, besides other books of a like character.

The suppression of the Society of Jesus by pope Clement XIV. in 1773 tested the bishop's qualities as an administrator. There were twelve Jesuits then stationed in Scotland, and by the suppression of their order they came under the rule of bishop Hay, and gave him no little trouble. A more trying ordeal for the bishop was the persecution of his co-religionists in Scotland, which burst into fanatical outrage at the prospect of their relief from penal statutes. A summary of these statutes from the *Statute Law Abridged*, by lord Kames, reveals persecution so systematic and thorough as to throw the oppression of the Covenanters into the shade. The Covenanters suffered from the Restoration to the Revolution—a quarter of a century; the Romanists endured persecution less or more from the Reformation to the Revolution, and from the latter period increasingly until 1793, when the more obnoxious statutes were repealed. After William III. was settled on the throne a statute was passed condensing the anti-Romish legislation of previous years and giving it a sharper edge. According to this statute Roman priests were to be apprehended and banished, and if they returned they were to be hanged; persons hearing mass, or refusing to attend the Presbyterian service, were liable to the same punishment; the possessors of popish books were to be banished and their property confiscated; the presbyteries were to summon "all Papists and those suspected of Papistry" and cause them to make satisfaction to the Kirk, failing which their property was to be

¹ Mr. Abernethy, an Episcopal clergyman (afterwards Dr. Abernethy Drummond and bishop of Edinburgh),

strongly anti-papal, took part in this controversy.

escheated to the Crown; Romanists were forbidden, under heavy fines, to educate their children in their own faith; they were legally incapable of purchasing or inheriting real property, and a Protestant turning Papist forfeited his estate to his nearest Protestant heir; they could be neither schoolmasters, guardians, nor factors, nor could they teach "any art, science, or exercise of any sort," under the penalty of five hundreds merks; Protestants engaging Roman Catholic servants were subject to the same penalty, and the informer was entitled to the fine.¹

These iniquitous statutes are probably unmatched for severity in the code of any Christian nation. The Romanists were denied religion, property, employment, except at the expense of apostacy from their faith—proscribed as slaves and outlaws, and degraded into brutal ignorance by force of statute. "To render men patient," says Burke, "under such a deprivation of all the rights of human nature, anything which would give them a knowledge or feeling of those rights was forbidden."² And William of Orange, notwithstanding his boast of religious toleration, put his signature to this statute.

Under the influence of Dr. Robertson the General Assembly, in 1778, by a majority of 118 to 24, pronounced in favour of relieving the Roman Catholics.³ At the close of the year a Bill was brought into Parliament for repealing the penal laws, and, notwithstanding the tolerant attitude of the Assembly, the Scottish heather took fire and there was a general flaring up of Protestant bigotry. Even the Established Church passed resolutions in presbyteries and kirk-sessions against the Bill, as did

¹ *Scots Mag.* xl. 513-517.

i. 285.

² Burke's Letter cited by Lecky, *England in the Eighteenth Century*,

³ *Scots Mag.* xl. 269, 270.

also the Secession and Relief Churches. Every corporation in Scotland was up in arms; town-councils, trades-guilds, clubs, and friendly societies united in the endeavour to keep the heel on the Papists' necks.¹ "The incorporation of cordiners in Potterrow, the seven united trades of Montrose, the porters in Edinburgh, the Berean chapel in Carrubber's close, the society of St. Crispin, the society of journeymen staymakers, the coal-hewers in and about Carnine, the friendly society of gardeners, butchers, sailors, flax-dressers, weavers, masons, all vied with each other in expressing their abhorrence of the proposed repeal. Seventy-nine ecclesiastical courts, two counties, forty-one burghs, twenty-four towns, eighty-four parishes, fifty-five corporations, and seventy-one private societies, recorded their hostility to the measure, as fraught with ruin to the interests of the Protestant religion."² A phenomenal feature in this display of intolerance was, that in the same breath in which the petitioners denied toleration to Roman Catholics they repudiated persecuting principles.³ Public excitement increased daily until the storm burst on the 2nd February 1789, when an Edinburgh mob destroyed bishop Hay's chapel-house, recently erected in Chalmers Close, and plundered the houses of several prominent Romanists. Similar outrages were committed the following week in

¹ This intolerance gives ground for the strictures of Buckle, who says that Scotsmen "do, upon all religious subjects, display a littleness of mind, an illiberality of sentiment, a heat of temper, and a love of persecuting others, which shows that the Protestantism of which they boast has done them no good . . . and that it has been unable to free them from prejudices which make them the laughing-stock of Europe, and which have turned the very name of the Scotch Kirk into a by-

word and a reproach among educated men."—*Hist. of Civilisation*, iii. 185. A more unbiassed author, Lecky, referring to the Scottish Establishment, is not less severe. "Few forms of religion," he says, "have been more destitute of all grace or charm, more vehemently intolerant, and at the same time more ignorant and narrow."—*Hist. of England in Eighteenth Century*, ii. 78.

² Cunningham, *Hist.* ii. 546.

³ *Scots Magazine*, xl. 565, 566.

Glasgow, and the magistrates in both cities stood helpless or indifferent amidst the violence of the mobs.¹

The popularity of principal Robertson suffered from his generous advocacy of toleration to the Romanists, and for a time he was the best abused man in Scotland. Robertson's colleague, Dr. Erskine, a leader on the popular side, forwarded to Edmund Burke, who had introduced the Bill in the House of Commons, a number of pamphlets and sermons published in Scotland against it. Burke replied in caustic terms.—“I am by choice and by taste, as well as by education, a very attached member of the Church of England; but it is as far from my wish, as I thank God it is from my power, to persecute you who probably differ from me in a great many points. I wish it were equally out of my power to persecute any Roman Catholic. I keep, at the same time, very just weights and measures; and as I do not take my ideas of the Churches of France and of Italy from the pulpits of Edinburgh, so I shall most certainly not apply to the Consistory at Rome, or to the Sorbonne at Paris, for the doctrines and genius of the Church of Scotland.”²

In the next Assembly, May 1779, Dr. Robertson resiled from the position he had taken up, and intimated that he had advised the government to withdraw their Bill in deference to the prejudices of the Scottish people. It was a lame and impotent conclusion, and the Roman Catholics had to wait fourteen years longer for the crumbs of tolerance which Presbyterian bigotry now denied them.

¹ Stothert's *Life of Bishop Hay*; Gordon's *Scotchchronicon*, iv. 148-174. Bishop Hay's report to Propaganda, Bellesheim, iv. 237; Sir H. M. Wellwood's *Life of Erskine*, pp. 304, 305. The riots in Scotland were thrown into the shade by the riots in London next year, May 1780,

instigated by lord George Gordon, another fanatical Scot. See Lecky, *Hist. Eng. in Eighteenth Century*, iii. 510.

² *Scots Mag.* xli. 412, 413.

³ Sir H. M. Wellwood's *Life of Erskine*, pp. 296-308.

One Episcopalian, Dr. Abernethy Drummond (afterwards bishop of Edinburgh), shared the discredit of fanning the flames of intolerance, having become embittered against the Romanists by theological controversy.¹

After the Assembly of 1780 Dr. Robertson withdrew from the management of ecclesiastical affairs, like his own hero Charles V., who laid aside the cares of a throne for the peaceful seclusion of the monastery. The principal had rendered valuable service to the Presbyterian Establishment at a critical period of its history, though his policy had laid him open, and perhaps justly, to the charge of harsh and unsympathetic Erastianism. He lived in retirement at Grange House, Edinburgh, spending the evening of life in literary pursuits more congenial to his tastes than the bickerings of the Assembly. When he died in 1793, his colleague, Dr. Erskine, always his rival in Church politics, preached his funeral sermon and paid a well-merited tribute to the public services of the great leader.²

One of the most extraordinary incidents in the history of religious imposture was the appearance at this period (1780-1790) of a dissolute woman named Mrs. Buchan, familiarly known as "Lucky Buchan," of the town of Irvine. She professed to be the Third Person in the Holy Trinity; and, incredible as it may appear, many of the natives, some of them in respectable positions, became her dupes or accomplices. Among them was the Rev. Hugh White, minister of the Relief Church, Irvine, whom she declared to be the man-child of the Apocalypse, of whom she had been delivered, and who was to rule all nations

¹ Dr. Somerville, in his *Life and Times*, pp. 192, 193, represents Dr. A. Drummond as "a non-juring bishop." He was not raised to the Episcopate till some years afterwards.

He married the heiress of Hawthornden, and assumed the name of Drummond.

² Dugald Stewart's *Life of Dr. Robertson*, pp. 129-140.

with a rod of iron. Ultimately the inhabitants were so shocked at the blasphemies and indecencies of the fanatics that they expelled them from Irvine. About sixty of them, headed by Mother Buchan and her neophyte White, migrated to Nithsdale, singing as they marched eastward hymns composed by White, and set to ballad-tunes. When driven out of Nithsdale they took refuge at Auchengibbert, in Galloway, and there Mother Buchan died. The community had all things in common, even their wives, for marriage was reputed to be a carnal ordinance. Their children were committed to strangers, and infanticide was said to have been practised as it was certainly commended. How tenets and practices so outrageous could have been embraced by people usually so sober-minded as the Scots is a psychological puzzle. But the student of the philosophy of history cannot fail to have observed that the western district which bred this extravagant sect had been for two centuries the principal nursery of all the religious enthusiasms which had passed in successive waves over the country. The Lollards, the Covenanters, the Revivalists, the rabblers of the Episcopal incumbents, the sturdier rabblers of Presbyterian presentees, and now the Buchanites, all developed in the same region.¹ Without suggesting any religious affinity between these earlier movements and that of the Buchanites, still the *genius loci* may be supposed to have been in some way favourable to perfervid developments. The westerns were undoubtedly a peculiar people.²

The most notable incident in the contemporary history of Scottish Episcopacy was the consecration of Dr. Samuel Seabury, first bishop of the Episcopal Church in America.

¹ In a few years Rationalism fitly followed.

² See *The Buchanites from First to Last*, by Joseph Train.

The war which the British government had unwisely forced upon the American colonists resulted in their complete separation from the mother-country, and the establishment, in 1783, of the Republic of the United States. Hitherto, in the absence of local bishops, the Church in America had been without diocesan government, while its parochial corporations were controlled by the civil power. Its clergy had to be supplied from England, or candidates were sent thither for ordination, in either case at much inconvenience and cost. The breach with the mother-country ended this anomalous state of things but without making any better provision for the Church. Immediately after the Declaration of Independence, the clergy of Connecticut, in April 1783, applied to the English bishops for the consecration of Dr. Seabury, who had been chaplain of an American regiment in the British service. The bishops, though desirous of forwarding the application, could not dispense with the oath of royal supremacy in the consecration, and Seabury, as a citizen of an Independent State, was precluded from taking the oath. In this dilemma he followed the instructions given by his American friends and procured an introduction to the Scottish bishops through Dr. Berkeley, prebendary of Canterbury. In August 1784, Dr. Seabury made a formal application to them, in which he stated—"On this ground it is that I apply to the good bishops in Scotland, and I hope I shall not apply in vain. If they consent to impart the episcopal succession to the Church of Connecticut, they will, I think, do a good work, and the blessings of thousands will attend them. And, perhaps, for this cause, among others, God's providence has supported them and continued their succession under various and great difficulties, that a free, valid, and purely ecclesiastical episcopacy may from them pass into the western world."

The bishops entertained the proposal favourably, and Dr. Seabury was consecrated at Aberdeen, in the upper room of bishop Skinner's house, which was used as a chapel, on Sunday 14th November 1784, by primus Kilgour, bishop Petrie of Moray and Ross, and bishop Skinner, coadjutor of Aberdeen. A concordat was drawn up by the four bishops in synod "between the Catholic remainder of the ancient Church of Scotland and the now rising Church in Connecticut." It contained seven articles, and in the fifth, the "capital article," bishop Seabury agreed "to take a serious view of the Communion Office recommended by them, and, if found agreeable to the genuine standards of antiquity, to give his sanction to it." In accordance with this agreement, bishop Seabury, in 1786, adopted for his diocese the Scottish Office, with some slight alterations; and in 1789, when the American Church revised the English Book of Common Prayer, the Invocation was introduced and the Oblation restored to its proper place, so that "the prayer of Consecration followed the Scotch model." Dr. Williams, the present successor of Seabury, has expressed the opinion that "in giving the primitive form of consecration (of the Eucharist), Scotland gave us a greater boon than when she gave us the Episcopate."¹

Bishop Seabury was heartily welcomed by the clergy of Connecticut on his return, and presented with an address, in which they thanked the Scottish bishops for giving them "the desired blessing of a pure, valid, and free episcopacy," and adding, "wherever the American Episcopal Church shall be mentioned in the world, may this good deed, which they have done for us, be spoken of for a memorial of them." Seabury replied, "The sentiments you entertain of the venerable bishops in Scotland

¹ Dowden, *Annotated Scot. Com. Memoirs of Prot. Ep. Ch. in America*, Office, p. 117; see also bishop White's pp. 187, 188.

are highly pleasing to me. Their conduct through the whole business was candid, friendly, and Christian, appearing to me to arise from a just sense of duty, and to be founded in, and conducted by, the true principles of the primitive Apostolical Church. And I hope you will join with me in manifestations of gratitude to them, by always keeping up the most intimate communion with them and their suffering Church."¹

Bishop Skinner became sole bishop of Aberdeen upon Kilgour's resignation in 1786, and two years afterwards, when the latter resigned the primacy, Skinner succeeded him in that office also. The new primus was the most able and statesmanlike bishop of that age, an ecclesiastical leader after the type of Gadderar.

On bishop Rose's resignation of Dunkeld in 1786 the see went a-begging. It was declined by Dr. Abernethy Drummond, presbyter in Edinburgh, and by James Lyall, serving in Dunkeld diocese. George Gleig, presbyter at Pittenweem, who had already given promise as a man of letters, agreed to accept the bishopric, but the primus, from personal dislike of Gleig, refused to confirm the election, and most unjustly debarred him from the episcopate for fully twenty years. Bishop Petrie of Moray, who was in infirm health, received as coadjutor

¹ Within eighteen months an Act of Parliament removed the legal obstacles of civil supremacy, and William White and Samuel Provoost, two American presbyters, elected in the Convention as bishops of Pennsylvania and New York, were consecrated in Lambeth Chapel in February 1787. The Episcopal Church of the United States, whose episcopate had the auspicious beginning in an upper room in Aberdeen, now numbers nearly eighty bishops, including missionaries, 4000 presbyters, and over 400,000 communicants.—

Church Year Book, 1894, pp. 359 seq. For references to Seabury's consecration see MS. Register of College of Bishops, i. 33-46; Bishop White's *Memoirs*, pp. 158-160 and 324-332; Anderson's *Colonial Church*, iii. 426, 427; Skinner, ii. 683-687; Skinner's *Annals*, pp. 42-73; Thos. Stephen, iv. 397-402; Bishop Wilberforce's *Hist. American Ch.* pp. 195-232; Makower's *Constitutional History of Church of England*, English Translation, pp. 142, 153-156; Seabury Centenary Report, 1884.

Andrew Macfarlane, presbyter in Inverness. Alexander Jolly (afterwards bishop) was one of Petrie's pupils at Folla, in Aberdeenshire, and preached his funeral sermon, highly eulogising the ascetic piety and lovable disposition of the deceased prelate. The preacher was destined to transmit the model in his own person to the next generation. Dr. Abernethy Drummond was again elected to another see—that of Brechin—in 1787, which he accepted with the peculiar stipulation that he should have a coadjutor. The coadjutor was found in the person of John Strachan, presbyter at Dundee, in the same diocese. There is no explanation of this irregularity except that the Doctor was now willing to accept a bishopric but bent on residing in Edinburgh, and probably ambitious of becoming its bishop, as he did shortly afterwards.¹

Several indications have been given of a relaxed system of doctrine in the Presbyterian Establishment during the latter half of this century. The recent attempt to get rid of subscription to the Confession of Faith was a symptom of the prevalent tendency. It found more emphatic expression in a work entitled *A Practical Essay on the Death of Christ*, by Dr. M'Gill, one of the ministers of Ayr, published in 1786. The merit of Christ's sacrifice was asserted to lie, not in His death for sin, but in His fulfilling the Father's will and the requirements of the moral law by a life of perfect obedience. The term sacrifice was held to be merely figurative, and the orthodox doctrine of the Atonement was, by implication, denied.² Although much criticism was provoked by the work no judicial action was taken against the author until two years afterwards, when he published a treatise against the expediency

¹ MS. Register of College of Thos. Stephen, iv. 407-409.

Bishops, i. 47, 48; Skinner, ii. 687; Skinner's *Annals*, p. 67;

² See M'Gill's *Essay*, pp. 33 and 165.

of creeds and confessions. The presbytery then cited him, and from the presbytery the case went to the synod of Glasgow and Ayr in 1790. The rationalistic Doctor had no taste for martyrdom, and so he explained and retracted until he sufficiently satisfied the brethren of his orthodoxy.¹ It is a singular fact that this tendency to rationalism appeared in the west country among the descendants of the Covenanters.²

The Seceders, who kept a vigilant eye on this symptom of the "down-grade" in the Established Church, were not so easily appeased. To guard against the heretical teaching, the Burgher synod issued a "Warning against Socinianism," and the Anti-Burgher synod of Glasgow passed an overture on the same subject, in which they accused their Established brethren of being divided "about the most fundamental articles of revealed religion," and declared that the only bond of union among them was the civil establishment, and that, "were this old rusty hoop knocked off, they would fly into ten or twenty pieces." In this document they incidentally sounded the first note of Voluntaryism, which has now become a cardinal tenet in the creed of most Scottish dissenters. They recommended that "the public funds should be applied for the support of one minister in each parish, to whose ministrations they can with a safe conscience submit; or, what is perhaps the only effectual way of being quit of this cruel usurpation, let the public fund be applied to other useful purposes, and let every one pay his own minister, as he does his lawyer or physician." This view finds large acceptance in the present day, but it was not the view of the Erskines and the first Seceders.³

¹ *Scots Mag.* liii. 302; M'Kerrow, pp. 359-369.

² Cunningham, ii. 580; Grub, iv. 146. ³ M'Kerrow, pp. 369-371.

The Presbyterian Church in 1788 celebrated the centenary of the Revolution—"the happy and glorious event, that in the year 1688 delivered the nation from civil and religious oppression." The Burgher Seceders folded for the time their banner of dissent, and united with their brethren in marking the 5th of November as a red-letter day. In a few years the country was startled by a revolution of a more far-reaching character in France, which they regarded with less complacency, when the throne and religion went down into the dust together. The frenzy of the Frenchmen awakened nations and national Churches in Europe from their lethargy, and proved indirectly no mean factor in the revival of religion in Britain.

The centenary of the Revolution was marked by another event which had an immediate and beneficial effect upon the proscribed Episcopal Church. Prince Charles Edward died at Rome on 31st January 1788. His only brother, Henry, duke of York, was a cardinal in the Roman Church, and although he proclaimed himself as king Henry the Ninth, the Scottish Episcopalians felt no scruple about disowning his claims to their allegiance. In the diocesan synods the clergy cordially agreed to recognise the reigning sovereign, George III., and to pray for him publicly; and the bishops in synod were equally unanimous. Old bishop Rose of Dunblane, who was in his dotage, and James Brown, presbyter at Montrose, were the only two clergymen who refused to transfer their allegiance to the Hanoverian dynasty.¹

¹ Bishop Rose consecrated Brown to the episcopate, and Brown ordained a Donald M'Intosh to the priesthood; and there the little schism ended. M'Intosh is now remembered from his Collection of Gaelic Proverbs,

edited some years ago by Sheriff Nicolson. MS. Register of College of Bishops, i. 49-52; Skinner, ii. 688, 689; Thos. Stephen, iv. 412-420.

Early in 1789 primus Skinner, accompanied by bishop Abernethy Drummond and bishop Strachan, went to London to petition the government for relief from the penal statutes. The Scottish members of Parliament were favourable to their repeal, and not less so, much to their honour, were the leading Presbyterians at home, principal Robertson of Edinburgh, principal Campbell and professor Gerard of Aberdeen, all of whom had been active in the endeavour to relieve the Roman Catholics from still more oppressive statutes. The bishops were received at Lambeth by Dr. Moore, archbishop of Canterbury—the first time an English primate had received a Scottish bishop since the memorable meeting, a century before, of archbishop Sancroft and bishop Rose in Lambeth. They had interviews with several other English bishops who were disposed to befriend their cause, none more so than Dr. Horsley, then bishop of St. David's. For the information of Mr. Pitt, the prime minister, and of Thurlow, the lord chancellor, a paper was drawn up, entitled "The Case of the Episcopal clergy in Scotland and of the laity of their communion," stating the grounds on which they sought relief from certain specified statutes. A Bill of repeal passed the House of Commons without opposition, but when it went to the House of Lords the chancellor proposed its adjournment on the second reading. Thurlow was a thorough Erastian, and it was supposed that he had taken umbrage at some imaginary want of deference to himself. The premier and his chancellor were, besides, on the most unfriendly terms, and the bare fact that Pitt favoured the measure was sufficient to rouse the hostility of Thurlow.

The primus reported to a convention of clergy and laity in Laurencekirk the miscarriage of their cause in Parliament. A joint committee of three bishops, with the

same numbers of clergy and of laity, was then formed to take fresh measures for the relief of the Church. A small committee of lay friends in England worked along with them, and the result of the renewed application was, that in 1792 a Bill was passed granting relief to the Scottish Episcopal clergy from the penal prohibition of their ministry, but with two disabling clauses—that they should be incapable of holding preferment, or even officiating, in England, and that they must subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles as proof of their doctrinal agreement with the Church of England. The two conditions annexed were inconsistent with each other, for if the Episcopal Churches north and south of the Tweed were one in creed why were the northern clergy debarred from officiating in England, while the southern clergy were free to officiate in Scotland? Ecclesiastical reciprocity was not known in that day, and this unfair restriction was not the only particular in which the “predominant partner” was guilty of injustice to Scotland.¹ Not until the year 1864 was the wrong righted, and the last vestige of political persecution, arising out of the Jacobite episode, finally swept from the statute book.²

The persecution of a century had done its work on the Episcopal Church in Scotland—“Oft doomed to death, yet fated not to die.” In 1792, when relieved from penal statutes the number of clergy was reduced to four bishops, primus Skinner of Aberdeen, Abernethy Drummond of Edinburgh, Strachan of Brechin, and Macfarlane of Moray and Ross, with about forty presbyters, and her laity to less than a twentieth part of the population.³

¹ Thurlow took the same line of obstruction when a Bill was brought in a few years before by Mr. Dundas to restore the Scottish estates forfeited in 1745. See Parliamentary History,

xxiv. 1363-1373, and Stanhope's *Life of Pitt*, i. 225, 226.

² Skinner's *Annals*, pp. 87-229, 254; Walker's *Life of John Skinner*, pp. 76-137. ³ See Grub, iv. 91.

"The bush burned but was not consumed" is as true of the Episcopal Church as of any religious community that has come "through much tribulation."¹

¹ So lord Neaves remarked from his seat in the Court of Session. See *Scot. Guardian*, iii. 215. Dean Stanley writes, in his *Church of Scotland*, p. 45, that the Episcopal Church

"during and after the Stuart Rebellion was visited by a hand almost as heavy as that which had rested on the Presbyterians at the close of the preceding century."

CHAPTER XXV

FROM REPEAL OF PENAL LAWS, 1792, TO DEATH OF GEORGE III., 1820

Primus Skinner's report to convention at Laurencekirk—Acceptance of Thirty-nine Articles—Bishop Jolly—Union of "qualified" clergy with Episcopal Church—Election of Dr. Sandford as bishop of Edinburgh—Roman Catholic Relief Bill, 1793—Bishop Hay's influence on Roman Mission—Established Church plants Chapels of Ease—Moderates and Popular party in the Establishment—Their gradual divergence—Foreign Missions discountenanced in Assembly of 1796—Home Missions by the Haldanes aided by Simeon and Rowland Hill—Ferment from their preaching—Low ebb of religion in Scotland—Character of Presbyterian worship—Haldanes become Congregationalists and finally Baptists—Burghers and Anti-Burghers divide into New and Old Lights—Contest between Moderates and Evangelicals on pluralities—Bishops Torry and Gleig—Attempt to enforce Scottish Office—Episcopal synod restricts presbyters to rubrics—General Synod of 1811—Poverty of clergy—Regium Donum to Episcopalians—Parliamentary Annuity to Presbyterians—Death of Primus Skinner and his services—Election of bishops William Skinner and David Low—Death of George III.

To a convention of clergy and laity at Laurencekirk, 22nd August 1792, primus Skinner reported the steps taken to secure relief from the penal laws, and the terms of the repeal Act. He treated with indifference the exclusion of the Scottish clergy from English benefices, arguing that "they ought to have none else for ministers but those who expect their reward in a better country than England, and from a Master whose kingdom is not of this world." With regard to subscription to the

Thirty-nine Articles he explained that the clergy were only required to accept their "general doctrine." The alleged Calvinism of the seventeenth Article was specially objectionable to the Episcopal clergy, and all the more so that many of the Presbyterian ministers were now recoiling from the severer form of it in the Westminster Confession. Bishop Skinner suggested that they should take into serious consideration the adoption of the English Prayer Book as a whole, seeing that they had no Liturgy of their own except the Scottish Office for Holy Communion.¹

Now that the penal statutes were repealed the primus renewed his efforts to reconcile the English pastors and congregations of "the qualified chapels," which had long stood aloof from the Episcopal community. With this object he suggested the consecration of a clergyman in English orders to the episcopate, and bishop Abernethy Drummond, to facilitate the project, offered to resign his see. The first nominee for the office was Jonathan Boucher, formerly a clergyman in Maryland, and now vicar of Epsom, whose acquaintance Skinner had made through their mutual friend bishop Seabury. Boucher was an able and learned man, and, like bishop Skinner and several of the episcopal clergy in Scotland, he had adopted the peculiar views of Hebrew criticism known as "Hutchinsonianism" from their author John Hutchinson.² Boucher's appointment miscarried, but the politic scheme was accomplished later under happier auspices by the choice of Dr. Sandford, one of the Edinburgh clergy.³

On the death of old bishop Rose in 1791, Jonathan Watson, presbyter at Laurencekirk, was elected bishop of Dunkeld, and consecrated at Stonehaven in Sep-

¹ Skinner's *Annals*, pp. 233, 245-255. *History*, ii. 673-678.

² Skinner's *Annals*, pp. 265-270; Dr. Hawk's *History of Church of Maryland*, pp. 269-271.

³ See Walker's *Life of Bishop John Skinner*, p. 169, note; and Skinner's

tember 1792. Bishop Macfarlane of Moray and Ross, though neither weighted with years nor episcopal duties, requested the aid of a coadjutor; and the clergy chose Alexander Jolly, presbyter at Fraserburgh. The primus opposed the election, on better grounds than in the case of Gleig, but it was confirmed by the Episcopal college. Jolly was born at Stonehaven in April 1756, educated at Marischal college, Aberdeen, and ordained deacon in 1776, while still under age, as was then not uncommon. He was trained in the school of bishop Petrie, and sustained the traditions of Rattray and Gadderar. His personal piety and simple apostolic life have long endeared his memory to many besides Episcopalians. He was consecrated at Dundee, on St. John Baptist's Day, 1796, and two years afterwards, when bishop Macfarlane resigned the see of Moray, he was appointed to "the sole Episcopal charge." He still retained the incumbency of Fraserburgh according to a custom of the time necessitated by the absence of episcopal endowments.¹

Bishop Jolly took an active part in persuading the clergy to accept the Thirty-nine Articles as required by the Statute of 1792. The primus suggested an explanation, in the form of a preamble, of the sense in which they should accept the Articles. This idea was abandoned from fear of misunderstanding, and in a convocation² of the bishops and clergy held at Laurencekirk, 24th October 1804, the Articles were accepted without qualification. Bishop Jolly made a long speech, in which he showed the wisdom of the serpent by an adroit reference to the first Anglican reformers and the Caroline divines, who were

¹ MS. Register College of Bishops, i. 55-57; Skinner's *Annals*, pp. 283, 284; Walker's *Memoir of Bishop Jolly*, pp. 43-45.

² The two previous meetings at Laurencekirk are called "Conventions" from their having comprised laity as well as clergy.

primitive and Catholic in their teaching, and had yet cordially subscribed the Articles.¹

After the acceptance of the Articles fresh overtures were made for union with the clergy of English and Irish ordination officiating in Scotland. The bishops drafted a concordat with these six conditions : (1) That each clergyman should present to the bishop of the diocese in which he ministered a copy of his letters of orders for registration ; (2) that he should acknowledge Holy Scriptures as the rule of faith, and the Scottish Episcopal Church as a pure and orthodox branch of the Church Catholic ; (3) that he should be at liberty to use the Liturgy of the Church of England in all offices of the Church ; (4) make a promise on collation to a pastoral charge faithfully to perform his duty and to promote peace and charity ; (5) acknowledge the bishop of the diocese, and be ready to pay him canonical obedience ; (6) accept the foregoing articles as terms of union with the Scottish Episcopal Church.² In a short time several of the qualified clergymen officiating in Edinburgh, including Dr. Daniel Sandford and Mr. Archibald Alison, accepted the concordat, and were received with their congregations into the Church.

The time was deemed opportune for reviving the scheme of the primus for the consecration of an English presbyter to the episcopate. Dr. Abernethy Drummond resigned the see of Edinburgh, and upon a mandate being issued to the clergy for the election of a bishop Dr. Sandford was unanimously chosen, and was consecrated at Dundee 9th February 1806. Dr. Drummond, while still bishop of Glasgow, died in August 1809, and the see of Glasgow was again united with Edinburgh, so that Dr.

¹ Skinner's *Annals*, pp. 343-350 and 539-549 ; Walker's *Memoir of Bishop Jolly*, pp. 73-75.

² Skinner's *Annals*, App. pp. 553-555.

Sandford had the spiritual oversight of all the episcopal congregations in the south of Scotland, and also of those in the county of Fife. His appointment was eminently judicious, and calculated to heal the breach between the two sections of the Episcopal Church, a breach for which the Scottish bishops of a previous age were mainly responsible.¹

The Scottish Roman Catholics were at last relieved from most of the oppressive laws which had long disgraced the national statute-book by the passing of a Bill through Parliament in May 1793. Their three bishops intimated in July to pope Pius VI. their happy deliverance, and bishop Hay indited a pastoral letter to the flock in Scotland recommending loyalty to the throne and public prayers for the sovereign. The bishop had received, in 1780, as his coadjutor in the Lowland district, his early friend John Geddes, rector of the Scots college in Spain, which had been recently removed from Madrid to Valladolid. The Scots colleges at Paris and Rome were in an unsatisfactory condition, and failed to train suitable men for the Scottish mission. In the Paris college Jansenism had long been dominant, and at Rome, upon the suppression of the Jesuits, from whom the rector was formerly chosen, the college passed into the hands of secular Italian clergy, entirely ignorant of the type of education required for missionaries in Scotland. Bishop Hay went to Rome and advocated the appointment of rectors according to nationality as heads of the different missionary colleges. His efforts at the time were in vain, but have borne fruit in the practice of the present day. The mission in Scotland was strengthened by an annual subsidy of 200 scudi from Propaganda; and bishop Hay's influence was successful in obtaining from

¹ MS. Register of College of pp. 358-404, 479; *Remains of Bishops*, i. 56; Skinner's *Annals*, *Bishop Sandford*, i. 48, 49.

the British government an annual grant of £100 to each of the two vicars-apostolic, and £50 to the coadjutor, besides a grant of £50 a year each to the seminaries at Scalan and Lismore, and £600 in capital to defray the debt incurred in their erection. Probably these payments were prompted more by political than by other considerations, and after a few years they were entirely withdrawn. Bishop Hay remodelled the *Statuta* drawn up by bishop Nicolson, and compiled a ritual for the Scottish mission, both of which received the approval of the Sacred Congregation at Rome. The Scots college at Paris was broken up by the French Revolution, and many of the valuable documents which archbishop Beaton had carried with him from Glasgow, and left to the college, were destroyed. At the close of the eighteenth century the Roman Catholic mission in Scotland included 3 bishops, 40 priests, 12 churches, and about 30,000 members.¹

The Established Church in the closing decade of the century was busy planting Chapels of Ease to supply the wants of the mining and manufacturing populations in the southern districts. The expediency of granting constitutions to these chapels came before the Assembly in 1795; and next year a committee recommended the local presbyteries, after citing parties interested in the erection of a chapel, to report the proceedings to the Assembly without giving any judgment. The popular party objected to taking the decision out of the hands of the presbytery as a violation of Presbyterian principles; the Moderates argued that the Assembly, as supreme

¹ Bellesheim, iv. 246-262, and authorities cited from Propaganda; Gordon's "Life of Bishop Hay" in *Scotichronicon*, vol. iv. Bellesheim represents bishop Geddes as making

"the long and fatiguing journey to Orkney entirely on foot," which suggests either a miracle or a mistake. Geddes closed a laborious life at Aberdeen in February 1799.

judicatory and the parent of presbyteries, should alone decide on the merits ; and it was thus ultimately settled.¹

Hitherto no action had been taken in Scotland in behalf of missions to the heathen. The internecine strife which had gone on for 240 years, from the Reformation downwards, between Protestants and Roman Catholics, Presbyterians and Episcopalians, had made all sections alike oblivious of the divine commission to make disciples of the nations. The Church of Rome had sent her missionaries to the East, and foremost among them St. Francis Xavier, the friend of Ignatius Loyola, who died after a life-long labour on the shores of China. The Church of England in the first year of this century, A.D. 1701, had established the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts and sent its missionaries east and west. Somewhat later the Baptists entered the field with Carey the self-taught cobbler, their first and nobly-devoted missionary, among the Brahmins of India. At last the missionary wave reached Scotland as the century was closing. Dr. Erskine, now bent with years, headed the movement in the Established Church, and the subject was formally introduced into the Assembly of 1796 by overtures from the synods of Fife and Moray. As an illustration of the deadness of the age to the higher calls of religion, the proposal, instead of meeting with cordial sympathy from ministers who were weekly expounding the Scripture record of the first missionary conquests, was hailed with a storm of opposition. All the arguments, now so trite and commonplace, about the utopianism of foreign missions, and about the heathen and the poor at home, and the charity that begins in that quarter, were paraded by successive speakers. Mr. Hamilton of Gladsmuir

¹ *Scots Mag.* lix. 430 ; Hetherington's *Church History*, p. 698.

was the most pronounced in his declamation against the chimerical idea of converting heathens into Christians. When he sat down Dr. Erskine rose, and, addressing the moderator said, "Rax (reach) me that Bible." The leaves were turned over, and the Doctor read, with studied emphasis, the passage about St. Paul preaching to the barbarians of Malta. "Think you," said he, "that when Paul wrought his miracles at Melita, and was supposed to be a god, he did not also preach Christ to the barbarians, and explain whose name it was through which such power was given unto men?" But Erskine pleaded in vain. By a majority of 58 to 44 the Assembly dismissed the overtures, and passed a futile and evasive resolution about embracing "any favourable opportunity which Divine Providence might hereafter open."¹

The Moderates, who in the Assembly professed a preference for Home Missions, had an early opportunity of proving their zeal in the crusade of the brothers Haldane. In the summer of 1796, after the close of the Assembly, Mr. Simeon of Cambridge, a leading "Evangelical" of the Church of England and a popular preacher of that school, visited the Haldanes at their country seat of Airthrie, under the shadow of the Abbey Craig, Stirling. Robert Haldane, the elder, who was proprietor of the estate, had served in the navy under lord St. Vincent, and his brother James had risen to be a commander in the mercantile marine. Robert had been disappointed in his first ambition to give his services to the mission-field in India. Both brothers now devoted themselves and their fortunes to missionary work in Scotland. Simeon

¹ *Lives of the Haldanes*, pp. 134, 135; *Acts of Assembly*, p. 856. Moderates comprised the majority, but some of the Seceders were not more favourable to Foreign Missions.

The Anti-Burghers passed a resolution in their synod of 1796 against them, and the Cameronians denounced them. See *Lives of the Haldanes*, p. 260.

and James Haldane went through Perthshire distributing numberless tracts, opening about sixty Sunday schools, probably the first Sunday schools in Scotland, while Simeon preached in several pulpits of the Established Church. Next year James Haldane began lay-preaching in the mining village of Gilmerton, near Edinburgh, attracting immense crowds by his erratic style of oratory, and by strong denunciations of the frigid legalism and veiled infidelity of the Moderates. Nearly every town in Scotland was visited in succession, and the people regaled with unsparing criticism of their Laodicean ministers. In 1798 the eccentric Rowland Hill¹ came by invitation of the Haldanes to open the Edinburgh Circus as a tabernacle for their ministry. On one occasion he preached to ten thousand persons, and on a second visit to twice that number, on the Calton Hill, his humorous style and racy anecdotes making him immensely popular. None of the Presbyterian bodies escaped his castigation. The ministers of the Established and the Dissenting Churches were alike chastised for their intolerance and bigotry, and for their want of the evangelical spirit. In a journal of his Scottish Tour, published in 1798 on his return to England, he enlarged upon the manifest defects and apathy of Scottish religiosity in a way not very flattering to the national pride.²

Whatever truth was in the charges brought by the Haldanes and Rowland Hill against the Scottish religion of that day, the persons directly attacked could not be expected to submit with composure to their censure. Ministers are but men, and they were naturally incensed at being held up to public odium by strolling lay-preachers

¹ He was an ordained deacon of the Church of England, but owing to his eccentricity was never promoted to the presbyterate.—Sidney's *Life of*

Rowland Hill, 3rd ed. p. 95.

² Sidney's *Life of Rowland Hill*, pp. 188-196.

like the Haldanes, and a vagrant rollicking Englishman like Rowland Hill. Their indignation boiled over in the Assembly of 1799. Various synods had sent up overtures protesting against the misrepresentation to which the Church had been subjected. In stormy haste the Assembly passed a declaratory Act, and sent a pastoral letter to be read in every parish church and chapel. By the first section of the Act none but licentiates of the Church of Scotland were to receive presentation to a parish; and by the second, ministers of the Established Church were prohibited from employing any one to preach or to dispense any ordinance of the Gospel, except authorised licentiates or ministers, and from holding ministerial communion with persons outside of the Establishment.¹

There is no doubt that the second section was aimed at the Haldanes and the two English evangelists, Simeon and Rowland Hill. This was afterwards made clear by the language of the pastoral, which spoke of persons "at present going through the land acting as universal itinerant teachers, intruding themselves into parishes without any call, erecting Sunday schools without any countenance of the presbytery, bringing together assemblies of people on the fields or in places not intended for public worship, as if they alone were possessed of some secret and novel method of bringing men to heaven." There was a singular want of consistency in men who boasted of being the descendants of the first Reformers and of the Covenanters, now inveighing against assailants of the religion established by law, and against preaching in fields and in other places "not intended for public worship." These were the very measures adopted by

¹ *Acts of Assembly*, pp. 868-875; pp. 699-702; *Cook's Life of Dr. Hill*, Hetherington's *History of Church*, pp. 171-175.

their forefathers, first against the Roman and then against the Episcopal Church when established by law, but now the engineer cries out when hoist by his own petard.¹ The Seceders were not more favourable to the missionary enterprise of the Haldanes and the Englishmen. In 1798 the Anti-Burgher synod prohibited its members from attending their preachings, and next year deposed and excommunicated a minister for having done so. The synod of Relief took similar action, and forbade their ministers to give the pulpit to any one who had not received a university education, and been regularly licensed to preach the Gospel. The itinerant evangelists had not spared the dissenters, and this was probably their way of retaliating.²

Rowland Hill returned to Edinburgh at the close of the Assembly, and found, as he says, "all the city quite thunderstruck at the fulminating bull which had been issued." He was not the man, however, to be daunted by bulls, and in every sermon that he preached "he fired red-hot shots against the Assembly and the General Associate synod." "Three reasons alone," he said, "can be assigned for their conduct; these are madness, malice, or an attempt to discover our treasonable plots; and the first of these reasons should seem the most probable, the pastoral admonition being dated on the day of the full moon."³

While Hill's animadversions provoked bitter resentment in the Established and Dissenting Churches, the evil was overcome with good, for the crusade undertaken by him and the Haldanes was undoubtedly a contributory cause of the revival of religion in Scotland. It had reached its lowest ebb at the close of the century,

¹ *Acts of Assembly*, pp. 869-875.

Relief, p. 465.

² *Lives of the Haldanes*, 3rd ed. pp. 259-261; Struthers' *Hist. of the*

³ *Lives of the Haldanes*, p. 259.

and in the candid estimate of Presbyterian historians nothing could have been more deplorable than the actual state of things. Dr. Cunningham remarks that "the condition of many of the country churches at the close of the eighteenth century was very melancholy. In some the roof was in daily danger of falling down; in some there were no seats; in very many earthen floors sent agues and rheumatisms into the feet of the worshippers. Some are described as much more like sheds for cattle than temples consecrated to God. The damp air which met the parishioner as he entered was like the noxious atmosphere of a burial vault or underground cellar. In stormy weather the wind came whistling through the broken panes, and wet streamed down the unlathed walls and, penetrating the roof, dripped upon the floor. . . . So great was the contrast with the past that many have looked upon this age as bound up in the cerements of spiritual death."¹ Principal Tulloch is equally outspoken. Referring to the Assembly's treatment of foreign missions, he says—"This non-appreciation of what we now call Church extension was one of the worst 'notes' of the Moderate party, and indeed of the Church generally in the eighteenth century. Churches were not only not extended, but they were disgracefully neglected or abused. It is usual to blame the niggardliness of the Scottish proprietors and heritors for all that is abominable in the Scottish architecture of the eighteenth century; and the blame no doubt largely lay with them. But they merely reflected the general feeling. The Scottish people had unhappily lost the sense, from the Reformation downwards, not only of ecclesiastical beauty, but even of ecclesiastical fitness. They had no thought of making the House of God in itself a house of holy solemnity. This was part

¹ *Church History of Scotland*, ii. 586, 592.

of the reaction still unspent against the externalism of Rome, and it may have been associated with so-called spiritual feelings in the minds of some. But to a large extent it was nothing else than coarseness of taste and a want of culture; and its effects were in many ways unfavourable upon the popular habits. The attitude of the worshippers failed in reverence and even respectfulness. Devotion was conducted with a careless indifference of manner, if not of heart. The Scriptures ceased to be read as an integral part of divine service, and the singing was such as it is unnecessary to describe. . . . There was a lack of open vision in the Church of Scotland during the eighteenth century. She failed to recognise the greatness of her mission as a national Church. She failed to witness as she ought to have done to the living love of a Divine Saviour."¹

The Haldanes, partly from their own principles, and partly from the hostile attitude of the Presbyterian Churches, drifted into Congregationalism, and formed the first body of Independents in Scotland. Some time afterwards they embraced Baptist tenets and added one more to the religious sects of the country. This led to a split among the Independents in 1808, and a section of them formed themselves into the Congregational Union of Scotland, which met for the first time in 1813. Several young men of talent from the Presbyterian bodies joined the Union, and among others Ralph Wardlaw, a divinity student of the Burgher synod, who ascribed his conversion to the study—a logical result as some think—of Dr. Campbell's *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History*.²

¹ *St. Giles' Lectures*, first series, pp. 286-288; see *Original Statistical Account*, viii. 352, x. 271, xi. 129, xv. 575; and the *Scots Mag.* xxviii. 457, 513, 573, 576.

² See *Lives of the Haldanes*, p. 326, and Dr. Lindsay Alexander's *Memoir of Dr. Wardlaw*, pp. 38-46, 111, 112, 171, 172.

The divisions of dissent in Scotland are difficult to follow, and when the divisions are subdivided the difficulties are more than doubled. We have remarked upon the schism of the Seceders into Burghers and Anti-Burghers, and we have now to chronicle a further subdivision. The Burghers quarrelled over the continued obligation of the Covenant, and the power assigned in the Westminster Confession to the civil magistrate. In 1799 twenty-four congregations withdrew from the Associate synod and assumed the name of the Old Light Burghers. A little later the Anti-Burghers also fell out on the vexed question of the civil magistrate, and a small section of them, consisting of Dr. M'Crie, the historian, and four other ministers, who held by the old principles of their body, formed themselves in 1806 into the Constitutional Associate presbytery. For this they were excommunicated by the Anti-Burgher synod. The innovators in both these cases were the New Lights; and the men who held by the traditions of the original Seceders were the Old Lights. Dissent had increased at a ratio which made it as a whole somewhat formidable to the Establishment, but these miserable subdivisions on microscopic points reduced it to comparative impotence.¹

The separation of each of the synods into two parties had the effect of bringing the New Lights in either division nearer to each other, and we may anticipate the negotiations of some years by recording that, on the 8th September 1820, a formal union was ratified between them in Bristo Street church, Edinburgh, when they became the United Secession Church.²

¹ M'Kerrow, pp. 430-461 and 578-609, and *Life of Dr. M'Crie*, pp. 43-117. Dr. M'Crie, as industrious as he was learned, became the biographer of Knox and Melville. His writings,

though not free from partizanship, gave a strong impetus to the study of post-Reformation history.

² M'Kerrow, pp. 669, 670.

The Moderates and the popular party, who were latterly known as "Evangelicals," were still contending for supremacy in the Church courts of the Establishment under principal Hill and Sir Henry Moncreiff, the respective leaders. The popular side was yearly gaining ground, and a contest in 1805 for the chair of Mathematics in the University of Edinburgh turned the scales in their favour. The plurality of benefices was a subject which had divided them more than once. According to strict Presbyterian theory no such thing as the union of benefices should have been allowed, but exception had long been made in favour of a minister holding a chair in a University combined with a parish living, if the living were in the University town or within easy access. As the patronage of the Universities had hitherto been exercised by the Moderates they were naturally interested in maintaining the established practice. The popular party consistently opposed pluralities as in no circumstances allowable. The question was tested in the appointment to the chair now vacant in Edinburgh, of which the Town Council were the patrons. The Moderates favoured the election of Mr. MacKnight, one of the city ministers, and son of the celebrated commentator; the popular party supported a more eminent and better-qualified candidate, Mr. (afterwards Sir) John Leslie, who was already distinguished for his scientific discoveries. Great names bore testimony to Leslie's superior claims, and when the day seemed to be his, the Moderates forgot themselves and their liberal traditions by raising the *odium theologicum*, accusing Leslie of infidelity, and founding the charge upon a note in one of his works, in which he had characterised Hume's theory of causation as the most philosophical that had yet been advanced. In vain Leslie repudiated the heterodox inferences drawn by his

maligners. They dragged the case into the presbytery of Edinburgh, and from the presbytery it passed to the synod and to the Assembly. The popular party were the true liberals, and their opponents the champions of illiberalism. The debate, which lasted two days, was one of the most brilliant ever heard in the Assembly. Amidst breathless silence the vote was taken, and it was found that 96 members to 84 had decided against the competency of interfering. The Moderates had not only lost the day but inflicted irretrievable damage on their reputation as liberals in religion and as fair-minded men.¹

The contemporary annals of Episcopacy are chiefly concerned with the succession of bishops, the holding of synods, and the framing of canons. The want of a broad liberal government in the Episcopal Church was responsible for this periodical patching of canons honestly meant to improve a system of administration that was radically weak and faulty.

When bishop Watson of Dunkeld died, in June 1808, the clergy by a majority chose as his successor Dr. George Gleig, presbyter at Stirling, now elected for the third time to the same see within twenty-two years. The election not being unanimous, Gleig generously waived his claims to the bishopric in favour of the other nominee, Patrick Torry, presbyter at Peterhead, who was accordingly consecrated at Aberdeen on the 12th October.² In the same autumn the aged bishop Strachan of Brechin requested a coadjutor, and upon a mandate being issued to the clergy they unanimously chose Dr.

¹ For the Leslie controversy see professor Dugald Stewart's *Short Statement of Facts*; Cook's *Life of Dr. Hill*, p. 207; Lord Cockburn's *Memorials*, pp. 200-211; Francis Horner's article in *Edinburgh Review*,

No. XIII.

² The minority against Gleig consisted of two presbyters, and one of them was John Skinner of Forfar, elder son of the primus.

Gleig, as they had done on the previous vacancy.¹ It was difficult for the primus and the Episcopal college to resist the preferment of a worthy and learned man like Gleig, so often elected to a bishopric.² But the primus, if he dare not arbitrarily reject the bishop-elect, could impose conditions calculated to hamper his acceptance. Bishop Torry had been induced before his consecration to sign a declaration in favour of the Scottish Office, and the primus intimated to Dr. Gleig that he must do likewise. By the declaration the signer bound himself "strenuously to recommend by his own practice, and by every other means in his power, the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist as laid down in our excellent Communion Office." It is needless to say that this conduct of the primus was entirely unconstitutional, and subversive of the freedom of the Episcopate; moreover, it was not consistent with the statement made by himself to the archbishop of Canterbury in 1789 that the Scottish clergy were at liberty to use either office as they and their congregations preferred. Dr. Gleig used the Scottish Office at Stirling—he was the only clergyman in the diocese of Edinburgh who did so—and though he had no personal objection to the terms of the declaration he deprecated the exacting of it as a condition of advancement to the Episcopate. It was an unwise attempt of northern churchmen to protect the national Liturgy against southern influence. Fifty years afterwards, when the headquarters of Episcopacy was not Aberdeen but Edinburgh, the southern majority were equally unfair in relegating the Scottish Office by canon law to a subordinate and invidious position. History teaches by

¹ See Walker's *Memoir of Bishop Gleig*, p. 280.

² Gleig was elected three times to

the bishopric of Dunkeld and twice to that of Brechin.

examples, and the lesson to be drawn from these extremes is surely to put the Scottish and English Offices on a footing of perfect equality. Dr. Gleig signed the declaration, and was consecrated at Aberdeen on the 30th October 1808, being then in his fifty-fifth year.¹

In the primary charge which bishop Gleig addressed to his clergy at Stonehaven, 24th August 1809, he animadverted severely upon the numerous changes made in the service by each clergyman "according to his own judgment or caprice." As the primus was guilty of taking liturgical liberties he imagined that the bishop's strictures were aimed at him, and remonstrated with him by letter. Gleig assured him that his sole object was to regulate the conduct of his own clergy and not that of others, whether bishops or presbyters. "I found," he said, "that I could not officiate for some of my own clergy without either showing the people that he and I think differently of our forms of prayer, or taking a lesson from him how to read before going into chapel."²

Two days after delivering his charge, bishop Gleig met the primus in Aberdeen at an Episcopal synod, which was also attended by the bishops of Ross, Moray, and Dunkeld. The influence of Dr. Gleig is traceable in the six brief canons that were framed. The 1st enacted that the clergy of one diocese should take no directions from any bishop or presbyter in another diocese, and the

¹ MS. Register of College of Bishops, i. 58, 59; Skinner's *Annals*, pp. 433-479; Thos. Stephen, iv. 482, 483; Walker's *Memoir of Bishop Gleig*, pp. 260-269. Gleig, like Jolly, was "a man of the Mearns," a native of Arbuthnott, a few miles from Stonehaven.

² Skinner's *Annals*, pp. 483-493. The author of the *Annals* was John Skinner of Forfar, latterly dean of Dunkeld, who became a warm

supporter of the policy of bishop Gleig. He was the elder son of the primus, so that three generations of Skinners, and all of them Johns, were authors—John Skinner of Linshart who wrote the *History of the Church* and much besides, John the primus, son of the historian, author of *Primitive Truth and Order*, and his son John of Forfar, the *Annalist*.

5th and 6th, that the rubrics prefixed to the Communion Office should be strictly observed, and that no innovations should be permitted in the service except with the bishop's consent. The 2nd canon contained the following remarkable clause in its conclusion—"It being always understood that they (the presbyters) still retain the right of appealing from any sentence of their own bishop, by which they may think themselves aggrieved, to the primus and other comprovincial bishops, *with the representatives of the other clergy met in synod.*" Hitherto the presbyters had had little synodical power, but by this canon they obtained a seat with the bishops in a judicial court of appeal. It was only a return to primitive custom when the presbyters sat as assessors to the bishops in the Œcumenical Councils. For some unexplained reason the canon which conferred the ancient privilege on the presbyterate has remained a dead letter to the present day.¹

There had been no "General Synod" since the Revolution, and it was no doubt due to the influence of bishop Gleig that one was summoned to meet at Aberdeen on 19th June 1811. All the six bishops were present, besides four deans and a clerical representative from each diocese. For the first time a separate chamber was assigned to the presbyters, and dean Walker of Edinburgh was chosen prolocutor. The synod sat for two days, and approved of a new code of canons, twenty-six in number. The 5th, "for holding and regulating the business of Ecclesiastical Synods," made a new departure by admitting the presbyters to a co-ordinate voice in all legislation. It ran as follows—"Whereas hitherto the constitution of the Church has been such that a synod, called for the purpose

¹ Grub, iv. 126, 127; Skinner's *Memoir of Bishop Gleig*, pp. 268-277.
Annals, pp. 483-493; Neale's *Life of Bishop Torry*, pp. 75, 76; Walker's

even of enacting a body of laws or canons, has consisted of the bishops only, aided by the advice of the deans only, who sat with them in the same chamber, and whereas this practice appears inexpedient in the present circumstances of the Church, it is hereby enacted that henceforth every synod called for the purpose of altering the code of canons shall consist of two chambers, of which the second shall be comprised of the deans and the representatives of the clergy, one such representative being chosen from each diocese in which there are more than four presbyters ; and that no law or canon shall be enacted or abrogated, but by the consent and with the approbation of both chambers." The 15th canon invested the Scottish Office with primary authority, and enacted that it should be used in all consecrations of bishops, and not laid aside where now used but by the authority of the College of Bishops. By the 16th, all presbyters and deacons were required to "adhere strictly to the words of the English Liturgy in the Morning and Evening Service"; and by the 19th permission was given to baptize conditionally converts who expressed "a doubt of the validity of the baptism" they had received. In the Appendix there was inserted a recommendation "to wear the surplice when publicly reading prayers or administering the sacraments, but to introduce it with prudence and discretion by explaining, where they find it necessary, the principles on which they have adopted the use of this very decent dress." The black gown alone was in common use in many Episcopal Churches, and continued to be so down to living memory.¹

¹ MS. Register College of Bishops, i. 60-93 ; Skinner's *Annals*, pp. 505-517 ; Walker's *Memoir of Gleig*, pp. 277, 278. Dean Stanley, *Church of Scotland*, p. 44, believed that the

origin of "True-Blue Presbytery" and "Black Prelacy" was due to the Presbyterians wearing blue cloaks and Episcopalians black ones !

In the year 1811, bishop Hay of the Roman mission died at the age of eighty-three, in the seminary of Aquhorties, where he had for some time lived in retirement. He left a name long venerated by the Roman Catholics of Scotland, and deservedly so, as a true shepherd of the persecuted little flock.¹ His coadjutor, bishop Cameron, had, since 1805, taken the whole superintendence of the Lowland vicariate, in which there were twenty-eight missionary priests, all of them natives. Ten pounds a year was all that each of them received from the common fund of the mission, and it was but scantily supplemented from other sources. The majority of the Episcopal clergy had equally small stipends, receiving shillings where their successors of the present day, none too affluent, receive pounds. Influential friends were successful in obtaining from the government, in 1814, a grant of £1200 every second year, known as the *Regium Donum*, which was continued for several years and divided equally between bishops and clergy.² Ministers of the Established Church were more fortunate in their finance. By an Act of Parliament, passed in June 1810, for "Augmenting Parochial Stipends in Scotland," the sum of £10,000 was appropriated annually out of the public revenue to raise the stipends of parish ministers to £150 a year. This Parliamentary annuity is still paid; and to the credit of the Establishment it is being augmented by voluntary efforts to make the minimum stipend £200.³

Bishop Skinner closed an active and beneficent life on

¹ There are two portraits of the bishop in the Scots college, Rome.

² The grant was withdrawn in 1856, at the instance of Mr. Gladstone as chancellor of the Exchequer, because of the false impression it produced in England that Episcopacy in Scotland was as amply endowed as Presbyterianism was in Ireland from

the *Regium Donum*. The laity of the Episcopal Church at once raised a capital sum sufficient to yield the same amount in yearly interest.

³ See Bellesheim, iv. 269-271; Walker's *Memoir of Bishop Glaig*, p. 293; *Hist. Ch. Scot.* ed. Story, iii. 688.

the 13th July 1816, in the seventy-third year of his age. Such faults as appear in his administration were partly due to the bad traditions of the Scottish Episcopate; his merits as organiser and administrator were all his own, and his many public services to the Church place him among the foremost of her benefactors.

There was no difficulty in finding his successor in the primacy. The scholarship and administrative abilities of Dr. Gleig pointed him out as the most capable bishop to be primus, and he was unanimously elected. The appointment to the see of Aberdeen was not so easily settled. The bishops favoured the translation of bishop Torry from Dunkeld, and the promotion of Mr. Low of Pittenweem, or Mr. Russell of Leith, to that see, in order to have another bishop, besides the primus and Dr. Sandford, resident in the south.¹ The clergy of the diocese, however, elected William Skinner, then a presbyter at Aberdeen, and younger son of the deceased primus. Bishop M'Farlane was the only prelate who favoured the elevation of Skinner to the episcopate. Ultimately the other bishops waived their objections, and he was consecrated at Stirling, the residence of the primus, on the 27th October 1816.²

On the death of bishop M'Farlane, in July 1819, David Low of Pittenweem was elected by the clergy to the sees of Ross and Argyll, and consecrated at Stirling on the 14th November. Dr. Sandford had resigned the district of Fife—the bishops were still as chary about resuming the ancient title of St. Andrews as in the days

¹ With the exception of Aberdeen and Edinburgh the old see cities were not the residences of the bishops. They lived in the towns where they held incumbencies, e.g. Jolly in Fraserburgh, Torry in Peterhead,

and Gleig in Stirling.

² MS. Register College of Bishops, i. 94; Skinner's *Annals*, pp. 36, 37; Thos. Stephen, iv. 495; Walker's *Memoir of Bishop Gleig*, pp. 295-300.

of the Chevalier—in the hope of securing the election of Mr. Low as its bishop, but this scheme was for the present postponed.¹

George III. ended the longest reign—sixty years—in the annals of British sovereigns, on the 9th January 1820. During part of it he had been mentally incapacitated, and his son George, who succeeded him, acted as regent.

¹ MS. Register College of Bishops, i. 95 ; Walker's *Memoir of Gleig*, p. 316.

CHAPTER XXVI

GEORGE IV., 1820-1830, AND WILLIAM IV., 1830-1837

George Fourth visits Scotland—Bishops' address to king—Bishop Hobart on bishop Jolly—Bishop Hobart and dean Skinner on lay co-operation—English clergy in Edinburgh attack Episcopal Church—Episcopal synod on the subject—Dr. Walker's use of Anglican Liturgy in Rome—Dr. Luscombe's consecration for Episcopalians on Continent—Plurality of offices in Presbyterian Church—Dr. Andrew Thomson and Dr. Chalmers oppose pluralities—First Foreign Mission from Scotland by Assembly in 1824—General Synod at Laurencekirk in 1828—Another in Edinburgh in 1829—Their legislation contrasted—Death of bishop Sandford and election of Dr. Walker for Edinburgh—Franchise to Roman Catholics in 1829—Increase of Roman Catholics in Scotland—Reputed heresies of M'Leod Campbell and of Edward Irving—Their trial and deposition—Irvingite Church founded—Wider influence of Campbell's teaching—Controversy on patronage, 1832—Chapels of Ease—the Veto Act, 1834—Auchterarder Case—Attitude of Episcopal Church during Presbyterian agitations—Effects of the Oxford Movement on Episcopal Church.

FOR nearly two centuries Scotland had not been favoured with the presence of a reigning sovereign—not since the last ill-starred visit of Charles the First, unless the luckless adventure of his son Charles be reckoned amongst royal visits. George the Fourth was the first to break through a bad tradition. In the autumn of 1822, his majesty came to Edinburgh and took up his residence in the ancient palace of Holyrood. All classes were alike enthusiastic in giving him welcome, and none more so than the Episcopalians, whose forefathers had, at so much

cost, testified their loyalty to the throne of his ancestors, the Stuarts.

The six Scottish bishops, with as many presbyters, appeared at Holyrood and presented an address to the king in name of "the Bishops and Clergy of the Episcopal Church." In this address they said—"So many years have passed away since Scotland was honoured by the presence of its sovereign, that, to behold your majesty in the palace of the long line of our ancient monarchs, your majesty's royal ancestors, is to us, as it must be to every true Scotsman, a matter of pride and exultation; and in this house, more especially, do we feel ourselves prompted by these emotions to declare that, within the wide compass of your majesty's dominions, are nowhere to be found hearts more loyal than those which beat in the breasts of the Scottish Episcopalians. The devoted attachment uniformly displayed by the members of our Church to him whom they have considered as their legitimate sovereign is so well known to your majesty, that it would be waste of time to repeat it here, and is, indeed, amply vouched by the lowly station which we, her bishops, now hold in society. Your majesty likewise knows that our religious principles and forms of worship are the same with those of the Church of England, from which, indeed, we twice derived our episcopacy when it had been lost at home. We feel to your majesty that devoted attachment which our principles assure us are due to our rightful sovereign.; and should evil days ever come upon your majesty's house (which may God in His infinite mercy avert), the house of Brunswick will find that the Scottish Episcopalians are ready to endure for it as much as they have suffered for the house of Stewart."¹

¹ MS. Register of College of Bishops, ii. pp. 1-4; *Hist. iv.* 501-503; *Scot. Epis. Review and Magazine*, iii. 471-477.

The address was well received by the king, and he is said to have been specially struck with the venerable appearance of bishop Jolly. The bishop's primitive and saintly life, though spent in the obscurity of a small fishing town, was well known not only at home but in America. Dr. Hobart, bishop of New York, paid a visit to England in 1823, one of his objects being to see and converse with the northern bishop. Early in 1824 he visited Aberdeen, where Jolly had gone to meet him. Dr. Hobart afterwards described him as "one of the most apostolic and primitive men he ever saw." In reply to an Edinburgh clergyman, who asked if he felt rewarded for his long winter journey, he remarked—"You go from the extremity of Britain to America to see the falls of Niagara, and think yourselves amply rewarded by the sight of this singular scene in nature. If I had gone from America to Aberdeen and seen nothing but bishop Jolly, as I saw him for two days, I should hold myself greatly rewarded. In our new country we have no such men, and I could not have imagined such without seeing him. The race, I fear, is expired, or expiring even among you."¹

During the forty years since the consecration of bishop Seabury the Episcopal Church in the United States had made notable progress—progress which its members attributed in large measure to the co-operation of the laity in its practical administration. Bishop Hobart impressed this idea upon Scottish Episcopalians, and John Skinner, presbyter in Forfar, who had previously advocated the presence of the laity in mixed conventions, published a circular letter to the bishops and clergy, in which he urged their admission to a share in the management of the Church. That management had been from the Revolution till recently altogether in the hands of the

¹ Grub, iv. 175, 176.

bishops. They favoured a policy of timid obscurantism, as if afraid to expose the Church to the breath of public criticism, or to entrust clergy or laity with a share of its corporate responsibilities. Thus nurtured in the shade, Scottish Episcopacy, though freed from persecution, made but little advance in the first quarter of the century, and not much more in the second. Mr. Skinner in his letter remarked that "ever since the synod of 1811 the Church as a corporate body had been in a state of total inaction, while every other denomination of Christians in Scotland had been assiduously busy in schemes of self-enlargement." "As things are now constituted," he added, "we have nothing to interest our laity, or excite their powerful co-operation. At present they are left in entire ignorance of everything but the right or wrong discipline of their immediate pastor's duty." While deprecating "lay interference in matters purely spiritual," he urged that "lay delegates should be associated with the clergy in ordinary diocesan synods and should sit with them in general conventions, and be allowed a voice not only in all matters of temporal concern but in framing rules of lay discipline." The Church would in this way, he believed, be "much benefited in matters purely secular by their co-operation, advice, and habits of business." Mr. Skinner, like other reformers, was some years in advance of his time. What seemed impossible in 1824 was accomplished, partly at least, half a century later by the formation of the Representative Church Council in 1876. The Church's progress has been greater in the twenty years that have followed than in the fifty that preceded this new departure.¹

It has been the fate of the Episcopal Church in Scotland during the present century, as indeed at other times, to be influenced in various directions by the more powerful

¹ Grub, iv. 176, and Neale's *Life of Bishop Torry*, pp. 112-117.

Church of England. Ever since the absorption of the "qualified" English clergy and their congregations into the Scottish communion, this influence had been at work. The dominant school of Anglican theology was then somewhat puritan, and with puritanism in any shape Scottish Episcopacy had no sympathy. Its teaching and traditions had uniformly been of the Caroline school as represented by Andrewes, Laud, and Cosin, and by the later non-juring divines. A number of the English clergy ministering in Scotland at this period were Calvinistic, and held what were then commonly misnamed "Evangelical" views. Gerard Noel, a popular preacher of this stamp, came to Edinburgh about 1821, and, along with another English clergyman, Edward Craig, commenced an attack upon the more distinctive principles of Episcopacy. Many Presbyterians, attracted by their style of preaching, became nominal members of their communion; Episcopalians on the other hand, both lay and clerical, felt aggrieved by their misrepresentations. The disorder continued for some years, and in 1826 bishop Sandford was urged to take judicial measures against Craig for slandering his brother clergy, and especially Dr. Walker, recently appointed professor of Theology. As the bishop showed reluctance to exercise an authority which was certain to be repudiated, an Episcopal synod was held at Edinburgh in August 1826. To this synod a declaration was presented by the deans of Edinburgh, Aberdeen, Moray, Ross, and Dunkeld, by the archdeacons of Edinburgh and Ross, and by twenty-nine presbyters and deacons, protesting against the unfounded statements as to their teaching made by a minister of their own communion. The bishops thanked the clergy for the address, but declined to take any action at the suggestion of their presbyters lest it should form a dangerous precedent. The only outcome of the contro-

versy was bishop Jolly's *Friendly Address on Baptismal Regeneration*.¹

Dr. Walker, the first Pantonian professor of theology, was incumbent of St. Peter's chapel, and afterwards successively dean and bishop of Edinburgh. He had frequent opportunities of foreign travel, and being in Rome during the winter of 1817-1818, he began on Advent Sunday an English service, which led to the permanent use of the Anglican liturgy in the ancient city. "It was proposed," he says, "to make a direct application to the pope (Pius VII.) for permission ; but this was very properly checked, for the slightest reflection proved to us that such an application could not be successful, and would even force the government to stop our proceedings. Our service, however, was quite as public and as well known to every individual in Rome² as any the most noted ceremony or service of their own ; and we were well assured that the pope and his ministers were not only disposed to wink at our proceedings, but that they were even gratified by the decorous and unostentatious manner in which we studied to conduct them."³ Dr. Walker's object was to minister exclusively to the British residents in Rome, and whether or not his proceedings were regarded by the papal court with the complacency he indicates, this action on the part of a Scottish presbyter is noteworthy as forming an early precedent for a now established custom.⁴

Dr. Matthew Luscombe, an English priest, was officiating at the same time in Paris for the benefit of British and American residents, of whom there were many in

¹ MS. Reg. of Coll. of Bishops, ii. 10-13 ; Thos. Stephen, iv. 499, 500 ; Neale's *Life of Bishop Torry*, pp. 140-147.

² Query, to British residents in Rome.

³ *Scottish Episcopal Review and*

Magazine, i. 26-31 ; Thos. Stephen, iv. 496, 505, 517.

⁴ There are now in Rome three Episcopal churches, two English and one American, besides Presbyterian and other protestant communities.

that city after the close of the great European war. He suggested the consecration of a bishop to exercise episcopal superintendence over the clergy and congregations on the Continent, particularly in France, and expressed his willingness to undertake the office. The British government was consulted, but Mr. Canning was afraid of offending the susceptibilities of the French, and the English bishops declined to move without the sanction of the government. Dr. Luscombe then followed the example of Dr. Seabury, and applied to the Scottish bishops. They were not so unanimous as their predecessors had been on the application of the American presbyter. After some little delay and a protest from bishops Torry and Skinner, who questioned the prudence of the proceeding, Dr. Luscombe was consecrated at Stirling on Palm Sunday, 1825, by primus Gleig and the bishops of Edinburgh and Ross. They were careful in the deed of consecration to safeguard their action by disclaiming all pretence of assigning diocesan jurisdiction to bishop Luscombe, and by warning him against any attempt to proselytise the natives of foreign countries. "We do solemnly enjoin our right reverend brother not to disturb the peace of any Christian society established as the national Church in whatever country he may chance to sojourn, but to confine his ministrations to British subjects, and such other Christians as may profess to be of a Protestant Episcopal Church." The mission of bishop Luscombe realised neither the fears of its opponents nor the hopes of its supporters, and is now chiefly noteworthy as a precedent which has been followed by the Anglican Church.¹

¹ MS. Reg. of Coll. of Bishops, ii. 5-7; Thos. Stephen, iv. 506-508; Neale's *Life of Bishop Torry*, pp. 118-138; Walker's *Memoirs of Bishop Jolly*, pp. 112-115, and of *Bishop Gleig*, pp. 340-344. The

consecration by a section of the Irish bishops in 1894 of a Spaniard, Senor Cabrera, as bishop of a Spanish community of disaffected Roman Catholics, obviously stands on a different footing.

In this same year, 1825, the plurality of offices (a subject which had periodically disturbed the peace of the Established Church) came up again for discussion in the Assembly upon the Crown's nomination of principal Macfarlane, Glasgow, to the High Church of that city. The Evangelicals, who were anti-pluralists, had now for leaders Dr. Andrew Thomson and Dr. Thomas Chalmers. Thomson had been transferred from Perth to New Greyfriars', Edinburgh, in 1810, and four years afterwards became minister of St. George's, a large church recently erected in the western suburbs. He was a man of immense industry, and exercised a wide influence not only through his ministry but by the publication of *The Christian Instructor*, a periodical which he edited for many years till his sudden death in 1831. Chalmers, who has earned a wider fame, was born at Anstruther, Fifeshire, in 1780, ordained minister of Kilmany in his native county when twenty-three years of age, and in 1815 appointed to the parish of St. John's, Glasgow, where he had Edward Irving for assistant. Here for eight years he toiled among the poor of the city slums, "excavating the home heathen," as he phrased it, building mission churches and schools, administering in person the whole charities of his large parish, even superintending soup kitchens, and at the same time exercising a wide influence upon all classes by his powerful and eloquent preaching. All this work he maintained till called in 1823 to the chair of Moral Philosophy at St. Andrews. Four years afterwards he became professor of Divinity in Edinburgh University.

Dr. Chalmers had not always opposed pluralities. During the Leslie controversy he published an anonymous pamphlet, in which he said "that after the satisfactory discharge of his parish duties, a minister may enjoy five days in the week of uninterrupted leisure for the prose-

cution of any science in which his taste may dispose him to engage." Quotation was made from this pamphlet in the Assembly by a Moderate who was aware of the authorship. Chalmers at once acknowledged it, and explicitly recanted his former views. His Glasgow experience had impressed him with higher ideas of the Christian ministry, and a deeper sense of its responsibilities and opportunities. He was already busy with his Church Extension scheme, so fruitful of result, urgently advocating a subdivision of populous parishes, and the planting of new churches to rescue the lapsed populations from practical heathenism. To Chalmers, with his new convictions, it seemed scandalous to appoint principal Macfarlane to the onerous duties of St. Mungo's in addition to those of the principalship of a University. In spite, however, of weighty arguments and fervid eloquence from the Evangelicals, in spite, too, of the vote of the local presbytery and synod against the appointment, the Moderates had a majority of twenty-six in the Assembly, and the presbytery of Glasgow was ordered to induct the principal as minister of the parish.¹

Nearly thirty years had passed since Foreign Missions received their rude rebuff in the Assembly of 1796. A more catholic spirit now pervaded the Presbyterian Churches, and it was wisely fostered by Dr. Inglis, who, though ranked as a Moderate, enjoyed the confidence of both parties. He brought the subject before the Assembly in 1824, and afterwards, by a pastoral letter, before the congregations in every parish. Year after year it was discussed, until, in 1829, Dr. Duff sailed for India, the first missionary to the heathen from Scotland in modern times.

A general synod of the Episcopal Church was held

¹ Hanna's *Memoirs of Dr. Chalmers*, ii. 373, 397-400.

at Laurencekirk on the 18th June 1828. Primus Gleig had been urging it for some time with a view to amend the canons of 1811, but the bishops of Moray and of Ross were averse to any further legislation. The primus and the bishops of Edinburgh, Aberdeen, and Dunkeld comprised the upper chamber; and in the lower there were present four deans and representatives from the six dioceses, John Skinner being their prolocutor. The thirty canons approved by the synod bore the title—"The Code of Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland," the word "Protestant" being now introduced for the first time. Many of the canons were identical with those of 1811. Of the changes and additions the following are noteworthy. The primus was to hold his office for life, and not as hitherto during the pleasure of his colleagues; but he was to be deprived of the primacy if he refused to consecrate a presbyter canonically elected to the episcopate, whose election had been confirmed by a majority of the bishops. On the subject of synods it was enacted by the 16th canon that "both General and Diocesan Synods be henceforth part of the statuted and canonical discipline of the Church," the diocesan synod to be held annually, and the general synod every fifth year. It was also provided that no canon should be enacted or abrogated unless approved of by a majority of the clergy in the several diocesan synods, and confirmed at an adjourned meeting of the general synod.¹

A misunderstanding having arisen as to the meaning of the 16th canon, another general synod, attended by all the bishops, was held at Edinburgh in the following year. It undid the important part of the Laurencekirk legislation by omitting the clause which provided for

¹ MS. Reg. of Coll. of Bishops, ii. 14-41; Neale's *Life of Bishop Torry*, pp. 113, 114.

quinquennial general synods, and by restricting the powers of diocesan synods. The 16th canon, as amended in 1829, reads thus: "Nor shall any law or canon affecting the constitution of the Church be enacted or abrogated, unless the same shall have been previously submitted to the several diocesan synods or consistories, and the sense of the clergy of the Church at large respecting the measure be ascertained. But the sense of the clergy at large being the sense of the majority, and the presbyters being more in number than the bishops, the sense of the clergy at large cannot have the authority of a canon unless adopted as such by the majority of the bishops synodically assembled." The alterations were supposed to be mainly due to the conservative instincts and timid apprehensions of bishop Jolly, who had considerable influence with his episcopal colleagues. Both he and the primus had long passed the middle arch of life, and their intellectual faculties were no longer what they had been. It has been remarked that Scottish bishops before and after the Reformation never knew when to resign. Such was the case now; and, as a consequence, the Episcopal Church suffered seriously for some years from senile administration.¹

Bishop Sandford died in January 1830, and was succeeded in the see of Edinburgh by Dr. James Walker, professor of theology. Dr. Sandford was a scholarly man of no mean gifts, and of much urbanity in private life. During his episcopate he did much to promote the peace and prosperity of the Church in the southern districts which he ruled. His successor was not less qualified by scholarship and accomplishments for the Church's highest

¹ MS. Reg. of Coll. of Bishops, ii. 43, 44, 64; Stephen's *Episcopal Magazine*, iv. 205; Lawson, pp. 384, 390-391; Neale's *Life of Bishop*

Torry, pp. 149-154; Blatch's *Life of Bishop Low*, pp. 150-153; Walker's *Memoir of Bishop Gleig*, pp. 353-360.

office, and he had, besides, the advantage of being a Scotsman, with a better knowledge of the characteristics of his countrymen than was possible to a southern. It is worthy of notice by both Episcopalians and Presbyterians—by Presbyterians who speak of the Scottish Episcopal as “the *English* Church,” and by Episcopalians who by their election of Englishmen to bishoprics and benefices do so much to confirm the erroneous impression—that Dr. Sandford was the first Englishman promoted to a Scottish bishopric, and his was a special case, and that on his decease the clerical electors chose as his successor a typical Scot, born and bred among the national traditions.¹ The difference in this respect between 1830 and 1896 stands thus :—In the former year the six bishops were all Scotsmen, ordained with one exception in Scotland ; at the present time not one of the seven bishops on the bench is of Scottish ordination.

The year 1829 is memorable in our Parliamentary annals for the termination of the long struggle of the Roman Catholics to obtain the last withheld remnant of their political rights—the electoral franchise. Though relieved of the penal statutes which violated their religious liberty, they were still denied their full privilege as citizens of the United Kingdom. Fox had proposed a measure of relief as early as 1805, and it received the support of other Whig statesmen ; but such was the force of the national prejudice, that full political justice was withheld from the Romanists until 1829. In April of that year Wellington and Peel, influenced by O’Connell and by the dread of rebellion, carried the Roman Catholic Relief Bill through both Houses of Parliament, and obtained for it the king’s reluctant assent. Scotland, as usual, stood out in

¹ Dr. Walker had been a student in both Aberdeen and Cambridge Universities.

bigoted opposition to the measure, and monster petitions against it were sent to Parliament from Edinburgh, Glasgow, and other towns. All Scotsmen, however, did not become frantic because their Roman Catholic fellow-citizens were to obtain the franchise. Lords Jeffrey and Cockburn, Dr. Chalmers, and other public men in Edinburgh, advocated their right to political liberty and equality.¹

The number of Roman Catholics had increased considerably in Scotland during the first quarter of this century, chiefly from the influx of Irish immigrants into the manufacturing towns. In Edinburgh it had grown from about 1000 to 10,000; in Glasgow it had reached 25,000, and over all Scotland the Roman Catholic population in 1829 was estimated at 70,000. They had 3 bishops, 50 priests, 31 churches, 2 seminaries, and about 20 elementary schools. Instead of the old division of districts into Highland and Lowland, pope Leo XII., in 1827, made a new partition of the country into three vicariates — eastern, western, and northern. Bishop Paterson of the eastern vicariate died in October 1831, and was succeeded by Andrew Carruthers, who was consecrated at Edinburgh in January 1833. After the Emancipation Act the Roman Catholics in Scotland devoted themselves with redoubled energy to the building of new churches and schools. The gift by a zealous layman of the estate of Blairs, on Deeside, near Aberdeen, induced the bishops, in 1829, to suppress the seminaries at Aquhorties and Lismore, and to found Blairs college for the training of a native priesthood. Jesuits and members of other foreign orders had been forbidden any

¹ The only offices now closed against Roman Catholics are the Lord Chancellorship of England, the Lord

Lieutenancy of Ireland, and the Lord High Commissionership to the General Assembly of Scotland.

settlement in the kingdom after the passing of the Relief Bill, but as nothing was said in the Act about orders for women, a convent of Ursuline nuns, the first in Scotland since the Reformation, was established in Edinburgh in 1832 under the invocation of St. Margaret.¹

In the opening years of the reign of William IV. the Scottish Establishment was seriously agitated by the teaching of two of its ministers, labouring in widely different spheres—John M'Leod Campbell, minister of Row, on the peaceful shores of the Gareloch, and Edward Irving, minister of the Scottish church in Regent Square, London. Campbell was libelled in 1830 by the presbytery of Dunbarton, for teaching the universality of the Atonement, and the necessity of personal assurance. When he pleaded that his teaching should be tested by the Scriptures, as interpreted by the old Scottish and Helvetic Confessions as well as by that of Westminster, a member of presbytery made answer—"We are far from appealing to the Word of God on this ground; it is by the Confession of Faith that we must stand; by it we hold our livings." The presbytery found Campbell guilty as libelled. He appealed to the synod of Glasgow and Ayr, and the synod referred the case to the Assembly in 1831, which, by a majority of 119 to 6, deposed him from the ministry. The Assembly had had long patience with the Marrow men, whose views were in some respects similar to Campbell's, and only after several years did they condemn the teaching while sparing the teachers. Campbell's trial was begun and ended on the same day. It was long after midnight before the Assembly reached the merits of his case, and a majority of the members had left the House in the belief that proceedings would be

¹ Bellesheim, iv. 275-282. Father Gillis, afterwards bishop, and long resident in Edinburgh, was chiefly instrumental in introducing the nuns.

postponed till next day. Campbell spoke ably in defence of his teaching, and his father, an aged minister, concluded a brief appeal on his behalf in the touching words—"Moderator, I am not afraid for my son; though his brethren cast him out, the Master whom he serves will not forsake him; and while I live, I will never be ashamed to be the father of so holy and blameless a son." But it was all in vain. "Moderates and Evangelicals laid aside their differences for the time, and cordially joined in thrusting out of the Church one of her most earnest and saintly ministers for teaching the dangerous and deadly errors that God loved all His children of mankind; that this love was revealed in Christ, who had procured remission of sin for all; and that man's faith in this revelation must be firm and sure."¹ The condemnation of Campbell, then a young theologian of thirty, is evidence that Calvinism still held its supremacy in Presbyterian courts.²

It is probable that the judgment in Campbell's case was in some degree affected by the strange events that were occurring in the neighbouring parish of Rosneath on the opposite shore of the Gareloch—events due in part to the influence of Edward Irving, with whose teaching Campbell was popularly identified.

Irving, who had been Dr. Chalmers's assistant in Glasgow, was called to the Presbyterian church, Hatton Garden, London, in 1822. In a short time he became one of the most popular preachers in the city, and a remark of Mr. Canning in the House of Commons upon

¹ Rev. Dr. Milroy, Story's ed. *Ch. of Scot.* iv. 288.

² Proceedings in Case of Rev. John M'Leod Campbell, Greenock 1831, pp. xxvii.-xxix.; Irving's *History of Dunbartonshire*, pp. 425, 426; *Memorials of John M'Leod Campbell*,

D.D., i. 68; Professor Story's *Memoir of Robert Story of Rosneath*, pp. 153-178. Campbell's matured views were published twenty years later in an elaborate work on *The Nature of the Atonement*, which has gone through several editions.

his eloquence filled his church with a fashionable congregation. In 1827 a new church in Regent Square was built for him, and opened by Dr. Chalmers. Next year Irving visited M'Leod Campbell at Row, and his biographer states that even then he was convinced "that the spiritual gifts of the apostolic age were not exceptional, but belonged to the Church of all ages," and would be restored as one of the signs of the second Advent.¹ This had been the subject of Irving's study for some time, and the outcome was his treatise on *The Orthodox and Catholic Doctrine of our Lord's Human Nature*, upon which the charge of heresy was subsequently founded. Meanwhile at Garelochhead, and on the opposite shore of the Clyde at Port-Glasgow, certain devotees believed themselves to have become possessed of the Pentecostal gifts. Miracles of healing were said to have been wrought, and devout ladies began to speak in unknown tongues, and to talk of walking upon the waters. Irving's impressible nature and predilections led him to regard these manifestations as signs of the promised Pentecostal outpouring, heralding the near approach of Christ. Presently his church became the scene of the wildest prophesyings and ravings in unknown tongues. This was continued week after week until all London began to wonder. The *Times* condemned the proceedings as "blasphemous absurdities," and many of Irving's friends imagined that his mind had lost its balance. At last the London presbytery interfered in May 1830, the result being that Irving was declared "unfit to remain a minister," and was removed from the pastorate of Regent Square church.²

The case came up before the General Assembly, and a committee was appointed to examine the treatise

¹ Oliphant's *Life of Edward Irving*, ii. 104.

² Oliphant's *Life*, ii. 296-298.

written by Irving, and reputed to be heterodox. They reported that he taught that Christ's humanity was sinless and undefiled, not because He was by nature incapable of sinning, but because the indwelling power of the Holy Ghost kept Him from sinning. The presbytery of Annan (Irving's birthplace), which had ordained him, was thereupon ordered to libel him for teaching the erroneous doctrine of Christ's peccability. Irving appeared before the presbytery on the 13th March 1833, and two thousand people crowded the church and its precincts to see and hear their famous townsman. When accused of teaching the sinfulness of Christ's human nature, he indignantly repudiated the charge. "As to my maintaining," he said, "that Christ is other than most holy, I do protest that it is not true. Before the living God, I do declare, it is false. I would give my life, and if I had ten thousand lives, I would give them all to maintain the contrary." It was in vain that Irving argued and pleaded with brethren who were at once his accusers and judges. The presbytery condemned and deposed him, and the Assembly confirmed the sentence. In the same church he was baptized, ordained, deposed.¹

And so Edward Irving, the gifted enthusiast, the brilliant preacher, the fervid herald of the reign of Christ on earth was, like his friend the saintly Campbell, cast forth as a heretic from the Presbyterian fold. Irving's health had been seriously impaired by the long strain of over-work and mental anxiety. His deposition from the ministry was the deathblow. He died in Glasgow on the 8th December 1834, in the forty-third year of his age, and was buried in the crypt of the cathedral. A

¹ Oliphant's *Life of Edward Irving*, ii. 342-392; *Edinburgh Christian Instructor*, xxx. 298, 445; Story's *Memoir of Rev. Robert Story*,

pp. 224-233; Hanna's *Memoir of Dr. Chalmers*, iii. 287-291; Hanna's *Letters of Erskine of Linlathen*, pp. 129-142.

stained-glass window, the memorial of friends, with a weird figure of St. John the Baptist—not unmeet prototype—sheds its mellow light over his grave.

Although Irving probably never dreamt of founding a school of followers, or of adding one more to the many religious sects of the country, this has been done under the ægis of his name. The new denomination is popularly known as “the Irvingites,” and by adherents it is described as “The Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.” It conserves much of what was prominent in Irving’s teaching, and has in addition evolved a complex hierarchy, high sacramentalism, and an elaborate ritual—all of which is phenomenal as the offspring of sober Presbyterianism in the nineteenth century. Campbell founded no sect, but he has a larger following to-day than if he had. All the Presbyterian Churches, not only Established but Dissenting, are, more or less, his followers now. His more ethical, although not altogether satisfactory, theory of the Atonement, with his humaner teaching as to the fulness of God’s mercy and love, has been among the chief influences that have broadened Scottish theology and undermined Calvinism in its last stronghold.

While these religious controversies were still burning, the first Reform Bill was passed in 1832. It gave a new impulse to liberal ideas of Church and State both in England and Scotland. The English bishops were warned by a peer to put their house in order, as if the fate of Church Establishments was already sealed. The Scottish Voluntaries buckled on their armour for a fresh and, they hoped, a final attack upon the Presbyterian Establishment. The United Secession Church and the Congregationalists supplied the most doughty champions—Mr. Marshall, a Secession minister, and Dr. Wardlaw,

the leader of the Independents. They were met by at least equally vigorous controversialists in Dr. Inglis and Dr. Chalmers. A war of pamphlets, letters, and leading articles in the newspapers was waged for some years with all the bitterness peculiar to religious controversies in Scotland. As a result of the strife, "anti-patronage" societies sprang up all over the country, and a determined attack was made upon the perennial grievance of patronage.

The leaders within the Establishment, while claiming the victory, were aware that the system of patronage was their weakest point ; but unhappily they could not agree upon a remedy. The popular party would have laid the axe to the root of the tree and abolished patronage altogether, while the Moderates were in favour of such modifications of the existing law as would restrain its worst abuses. In 1832, eleven overtures were presented by the lower courts to the Assembly, calling upon it to restore "the call" to its constitutional efficiency. The Moderates were not prepared for this step, and the overtures were shelved. Next year sixty-five overtures were presented, and the popular or Evangelical party now challenged a division on a motion, proposed by Dr. Chalmers, to form a committee of inquiry. It was defeated by a majority of 12 in favour of Dr. Cook's proposal to give the parishioners power to lodge with the presbytery objections against the presentee. This was as far as the Moderates were then prepared to go, and it was probably further than the law actually allowed, as being an infringement of the civil rights of patrons. It did not, however, satisfy the Evangelicals, who now resolved to fight the battle of the Veto pure and simple. The mere dissent of a majority of the parishioners, without reasons given, was to be a sufficient ground for the rejection of a presentee.

In this shape the question came before the Assembly of 1834.¹

Before entering upon the discussion of the Veto it was found necessary to determine the constitutional rights of Chapels of Ease and of their ministers. These chapels were of recent introduction, supplementary to the old parochial system, and their status was indefinite and unsatisfactory. They had no kirk-sessions, and their ministers had no seat in the presbytery, nor were they eligible for election to the General Assembly. The Evangelicals proposed that the ministers of these chapels should have all the rights and privileges of parish ministers. Apart from its justice the proposal of the Evangelicals was highly politic, seeing that the chapel ministers were elected by the congregations, and belonged as a body to their school. The Moderates regarded the proposal as *ultra vires* of the Assembly without the sanction of the State. In spite of their opposition and of the disapproval of several members on the other side, including Dr. Chalmers and Dr. Gordon, the Chapel Act was carried by 152 to 103 votes.²

The Assembly then proceeded to discuss the Veto. Lord Moncreiff proposed that if the major part of the male heads of families disapproved of the presentee, such disapproval should make it obligatory upon the presbytery to reject him. He argued that the old patronage Acts of 1649 had not been repealed by the Act of Queen Anne (1712) reimposing patronage, and that by the former Acts the people still had the power of Veto. His motion was carried after twelve hours' debate by 184 to 139

¹ Dr. Bryce's *Ten Years of the Church of Scotland*, i. 14, 15. The Assembly now met for the first time in the Tron Church; hitherto the meetings had been held in what was called

"the Assembly Aisle" of St. Giles'.

² Bryce's *Ten Years of Ch. of Scot.* i. 14-18; Buchanan's *Ten Years' Conflict*, i. 209-236; Hanna's *Memoir of Dr. Chalmers*, iii. 351-361.

votes. The Veto Act accordingly became an interim law of the Church, and was remitted under the Barrier Act to presbyteries for their approval. Dr. Mearns and 105 members entered their dissent from the Assembly's finding as being altogether illegal, as it was afterwards declared to be by the highest authority in the land.¹

The Veto Act was passed in May 1834,² and within a few months of its passing the legality of the Act was tested by a disputed settlement in Auchterarder. The earl of Kinnoull as patron presented Mr. Young to the vacant parish. Only three parishioners signed the call in his favour, while nearly three hundred recorded their protest against his appointment. The presbytery, under the Veto Act, declined to take the presentee on trials preparatory to induction, and the case went from the synod to the Assembly in 1835, the same Assembly which made the interim Veto Act a permanent law of the Church. The Assembly confirmed the action of the presbytery, whereupon the patron and presentee appealed to the Court of Session in vindication of their patrimonial interests. From its importance the case was argued before the full court and by the ablest lawyers of the day, Mr. (afterwards lord) Rutherford appearing for the presbytery, and Mr. Hope, the future lord Justice Clerk, for the patron and presentee. The pleadings lasted from 21st November to 12th December, and after two months' consideration the judges gave their decision. Five of them, including lord Moncreiff, supported the Assembly's right to pass the Veto Act; the other eight decided against it, affirming that the presbytery was bound to

¹ *Acts of Assembly* 1834, Abridgement, pp. 1037-1040; Bryce, i. 18-41; Buchanan, i. 237-296.

² By a section of the Presbyterians this Act is known as the Third Re-

formation, the First being the Reformation from popery in 1560, and the Second the Reformation from prelacy in 1638.

take the presentee on trials with a view to his induction. In the Assembly of 1838 it was agreed to prosecute the case by appeal to the House of Lords, which, on the 3rd May 1839, affirmed the judgment of the Court of Session and declared the Veto Act to be illegal.

Mr. Young became minister of Auchterarder, and lived to be highly esteemed for his own and his work's sake in the parish; but his induction, enforced by the highest legal courts in Scotland and England in opposition to the dominant voice of the General Assembly, precipitated the coming rupture. Other cases of disputed settlement, some of them as keenly contested as that of Auchterarder, had meanwhile arisen, and for ten years Scotland was convulsed from end to end by the non-intrusion agitation. This period, known as "The Ten Years' Conflict," ended in the disruption of the Established Church in May 1843.

The Episcopal Church had wisely taken no part either in the Voluntary controversy or in the agitation against patronage. She might have hampered the action and weakened the position of the Established Church by making common cause with the dissenters, but that would have been neither consistent with her principles nor conducive to her honour.¹ She chose the better part, standing aloof from the strife of the contending factions, while sincerely sympathising with the harassed and distressed Establishment. This sympathy the Scottish bishops expressed in an address which they presented to the king, through the archbishop of Canter-

¹ The historical position of Scottish Episcopalians is not that of dissenters from the Presbyterian Church, but rather of protesters against it, because since Presbyterianism was established at the Revolution the Episcopal

Church as a matter of fact had not been in communion with it. Scottish dissenters in the exact historic sense have all *dissented* and separated at different times from the Presbyterian Establishment.

bury in 1835, when the political agitation roused by the Reform Bill threatened the Church of England. "Whilst we tender," they said, "our most grateful thanks for the toleration we enjoy in common with all your majesty's subjects, we beg leave, adopting as we do the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the United Church of England and Ireland, humbly to offer our heartfelt sympathy for the present distressing state of that portion of the Church which is established in Ireland, and to express our alarm and conviction that the threatened attack on the Church, if extended to England, will be attended with all the calamitous consequences of the grand rebellion. Although we cannot conscientiously unite in communion with the ecclesiastical establishment in Scotland, we live in terms of perfect harmony with its ministers and members; and we regard with sincere and friendly concern the machinations which have been formed against that establishment, as well by pretended friends as by professed enemies; the principles of that branch of the Church of Christ to which we happily belong, having always been, and we trust always will be, 'to fear God and honour the king, and to meddle not with them that are given to change.'"¹

The ecclesiastical events of this period (1830-1840) drew the Episcopal Churches north and south of the Border into closer relations than had subsisted between them since the Revolution. The Church of England, nursed in the lap of Establishment, had become in the eighteenth century intensely leavened with Erastianism, which the Evangelical revival failed to cast out; while Scottish Episcopacy reared in the shades of opposition, and almost extinguished, clung more tenaciously to the primitive ideal of the Church as a spiritual corporation independent of the kingdoms of this world.

¹ Thos. Stephen, iv. 530, 531.

When the wave of "Liberalism" in 1832 threatened the Established Church in England, such of her members as valued the spirituality of the Church more than the accident of its establishment, turned their eyes to the humble dis-established Church in Scotland. The beginning of the "Oxford Movement," which Dr. Newman dated from the preaching of Keble's sermon on "National Apostasy" in the University pulpit on 14th July 1833,¹ led to a closer fellowship between the reforming anti-Erastian section of the Anglican Church and the Scottish Episcopalians. The principles of primitive truth and apostolic order professed by the latter, formed the basis of the new Reformation by which its promoters not only quickened, and, in a sense, saved the Church of England, but transformed the face of religion among the English-speaking race all over the world.² "'Tis sixty years ago," and still it moves. Probably no branch of the Christian Church has felt the vitalising influence of the Oxford movement more than the Scottish Episcopal. Listless and lethargic in the first quarter of the century, before the middle of it she had received the infusion of a new life.

Little remains to be told of the Episcopal Church in the closing years of William the Fourth's reign. Bishop Gleig was at last prevailed upon to resign the primacy in February 1837, and in the following May Dr. Walker, the youngest bishop, was by a majority of votes chosen primus. It was agreed at the same time to hold another Episcopal synod in August by way of preparing for a General synod to revise the canons of 1829. Before the bishops met in synod, Queen Victoria had begun her long and auspicious reign, 20th June 1837.

¹ See *Apologia*, p. 100.

² Hugh James Rose, one of the early Tractarians, and the only Cambridge man among them, on an

historic occasion when the lines of their policy were being discussed, said oracularly, "Let us go back to first principles."

CHAPTER XXVII

QUEEN VICTORIA: PERIOD 1837-1857

Bishops Moir and Russell consecrated—Death and character of bishop Jolly—General Synod 1838—Church Society instituted—Deaths of bishops Gleig and Walker—Their literary work—Disability Bill of 1840—Founding of Trinity college, Glenalmond—Queen's first visit to Scotland—Drummond and Dunbar schisms—Bishop Gillis and the Scotch-Roman Church—Borthwick heresy case—Deposition of Morrison by Seceders and formation of Evangelical Union—Debate in Assembly 1839 on non-intrusion—Effects of Dr. Chalmers's motion—Union of Old Light Burghers with Established Church—Lethendy Case—Marnoch case—Interdicts from Court of Session—Appeal to House of Lords—Debates in Assembly—Non-intrusion agitation—Bills before Parliament on patronage—Disruption 1843—Free Church of Scotland—Action of the two Assemblies—United Presbyterian Church formed—Old Light Anti-Burghers join Free Church—Endowment of Argyll and Isles—Consecration of bishops Ewing and Forbes—And of bishop Trower—Palmer and Eastern Church—Gorham case—Bishop Torry's Prayer Book—St. Ninian's cathedral—Papal aggression—Mr. Gladstone's letter on Lay Question—Election of bishop Wordsworth—Death of primus Skinner.

THE Episcopal synod met at Edinburgh in August 1837. Bishop Gleig and bishop Jolly had for some years been too infirm to attend synods. Neither was willing to resign his see, though each was disposed to receive a coadjutor. The synod agreed to give a coadjutor to bishop Gleig, and to unite Moray, in which there were only four congregations, to the diocese of Ross on the death of bishop Jolly. It was also agreed to separate the see of Glasgow from that of Edinburgh, and a

mandate was sent to the western clergy for the election of a bishop.

The rev. David Moir, incumbent in Brechin, was elected coadjutor to Dr. Gleig with the right of succession, and Dr. Michael Russell, incumbent in Leith, and dean of Edinburgh, was chosen for the bishopric of Glasgow. They were consecrated in Edinburgh 8th October 1837, the first consecration in the capital since that of bishop Alexander in 1743, and much had happened to Scottish Episcopacy since then. The residence of the primus generally determined the place of Episcopal consecrations. In the days of primus John Skinner they were usually held in Aberdeen; under primus Gleig, in Stirling; and now under primus Walker in Edinburgh. The ascendancy which for many years centred in Aberdeen, had by this time shifted southwards by way of Stirling to Edinburgh; and although the next primus had his residence in Aberdeen, the ascendancy remained with the south.

The day following the consecration, the synod separated the district of Fife from the diocese of Edinburgh, and added it to Dunkeld and Dunblane. The timid policy of the bishops is shown by their continuing to designate the primatial Scottish see as "the district of Fife." They still shrank from resuming the title of St. Andrews, being apparently as much in awe of popular prejudice as their predecessors had been of the royal prerogative of the Chevalier. The title was at last resumed before the death of bishop Torry; and his successor, Dr. Wordsworth, shed lustre upon the ancient see by subscribing himself for forty years, "bishop of St. Andrews."

On the 29th June (St. Peter's day) 1838, bishop Jolly died at Fraserburgh, where he had lived as bishop for forty and odd years. No one was present with him

in the hour of his departure. His attendant, upon entering in the morning, found the body still warm, with the hands peacefully folded across the breast. There was a pious legend in Fraserburgh, that "the angels laid the bishop out when he died." By his own desire the body was buried in the churchyard of Turriff, where he began his long and faithful ministry. The good bishop had reached the ripe age of eighty-two years.

His character has been well described by the intimate and trusted friend of his later years.¹ "It was formed," he says, "upon the model of the primitive saints, not as being, it may well be believed, the result of studious imitation, but the fruit of the same principles, cherished with a like earnestness and simplicity of purpose, and developed through the same means. It was the character so formed and exhibited that attracted to bishop Jolly a degree of reverence and affection which it is the lot of few men to enjoy. Few, indeed, have deserved to be so revered and beloved. The spirit of primitive and apostolic piety seemed to be revived in him. All who had the happiness and the privilege of familiar intercourse with him, saw that he realised a character which they knew not to be common in our age, while they could not but recognise its harmony with the most perfect development of Christian temper. He was a living example of the intrinsic beauty and attractiveness of religion as it may be developed through the Church system. It might, perhaps, be easy to find a divine as deeply learned; but seldom can the name of one be recorded who so thoroughly imbibed and exemplified the spirit of the blessed saints whose words and history were the subject of his study. The last book which the venerable bishop had in his hand the evening

¹ Mr. Pressley, his assistant and successor in the incumbency of St. Peter's, Fraserburgh.

before his death, was the treatise of Christopher Sutton, *Disce Mori* (Learn to Die). It was an art which the good man had been learning all his life long, and he had so learned it, that 'the last enemy' had no terrors for him."¹

The General Synod was opened in Edinburgh 29th August 1838, and lasted for a week, Heneage Horsley, dean of Brechin, being prolocutor of the lower chamber. The canons of 1829 were revised, others were added, and the code, comprising forty-one canons, was published under the title, *The Code of Canons of the Episcopal Church in Scotland*, the word Protestant, adopted for the first time in 1828, being now dropped.² The 2nd canon made a change in the position of the primus. He was hereafter to hold office only during the pleasure of his colleagues. The 4th canon provided for coadjutor bishops who had hitherto been appointed without canonical sanction. The 21st canon enjoined the use of the Scottish Office not only at the consecration of bishops but at the opening of General synods.³ The 28th canon enjoined the use of the surplice, which had been only recommended before. "In publicly reading prayers and administering the sacraments the surplice shall be used as the proper sacerdotal vestment." On the subject of General synods the 32nd canon enacted that "every

¹ Sermon on the death of bishop Jolly, pp. 19-21; Lawson, pp. 396-398. Full justice has been done to the bishop's saintly character in Dr. Walker's *Memoir*, pp. 155-162. Besides the Address on Baptismal Regeneration, bishop Jolly was the author of *Observations on the several Sunday Services throughout the Year*, the *Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist*, and *Some Plain Instructions concerning the Nature and Constitution of the Christian Church*. His library was presented by him to the Theological college, Edinburgh.

² Before the meeting of the first Pan-Anglican synod in 1867, bishop Forbes of Brechin wrote to the archbishop of Canterbury objecting to the title, "Protestant Episcopal," as applied to the Scottish Church. See Walker's *Memoir of Bishop Jolly*, pp. 130-133; *Life of Bishop Gray of Capetown*, ii. 337.

³ Primus Walker was a Frasersburgh man, bishop Jolly's life-long friend, and, like him, a strong supporter of the Scottish Office.—Walker's *Memoir of Bishop Jolly*, p. 153 note.

general synod shall consist of two chambers; the first composed of the bishops alone, the second of the deans, the Pantonian professor of theology and the representatives or delegates of the clergy, one such delegate being chosen by and from the incumbents of each diocese."¹ The clergy were to elect a prolocutor who was to have a casting vote, as the primus had in the upper chamber. The convoking of General synods was "left to the determination of a numerical majority of the bishops." The 40th canon sanctioned the formation of a society to be called "The Scottish Episcopal Church Society," whose objects were, "first, to provide a fund for aged or infirm clergymen, or salaries for their assistants, and general aid for congregations struggling with pecuniary difficulties; secondly, to assist candidates for the ministry in completing their theological studies; thirdly, to provide episcopal schoolmasters, books, and tracts for the poor; fourthly, to assist in the formation or enlargement of diocesan libraries."²

The "Church Society" was formally constituted at a public meeting in Edinburgh on the 4th December 1838, and its first secretary, and staunchest supporter for many years, was the rev. E. B. Ramsay, better known afterwards as "Dean Ramsay." The duke of Buccleuch was appointed patron, and its list of vice-presidents included the name of Mr. W. E. Gladstone. The Gaelic Episcopal Society, founded by bishop Low in 1832 with a limited object as its name implies, was now merged in the new and larger society. Not only in the Highlands but

¹ The Scottish bishops, from the time that they conceded to the presbyters their ancient right of co-ordinate legislation, persisted in dividing the General synod into two houses or chambers, contrary to the usage of the pre-Reformation

Church, whose Provincial synods sat always in one chamber.

² MS. Register of College of Bishops, ii. 67-97; Lawson, pp. 399-400; Stephen's *Episcopal Magazine*, vi. 323, 324.

throughout Scotland the stipends of the Episcopal clergy were, with few exceptions, miserably inadequate, and discreditable to the wealthier laity who were members of the Episcopal Church. At this time three-fourths of the landed proprietors in Scotland were reckoned to be Episcopalians, and yet their bishops and pastors, ministering to them the Word and Sacraments, were allowed to struggle on for weary years, not only without the means of supporting the dignity of their sacred office, but in many cases with barely enough for their existence.¹ The Church Society, never adequately supported, did something, but not sufficient, to wipe off the reproach of Scottish Episcopacy as having the richest laity with the poorest clergy in Christendom. The funds of the society, which still exists as a separate corporation for the objects specified in its constitution, are now administered through the Representative Church Council, founded on a broader basis and exercising a more beneficial influence.

The aged bishop Gleig died at Stirling 9th March 1840, and his successor in the primacy, bishop Walker, outlived him only a year, dying in Edinburgh, 5th March 1841. Both prelates were scholarly men, and rank among the learned bishops of the northern Church, a succession which has never failed, though the strands of the cord were seldom so strong as when Gleig, Walker, and Russell occupied the Episcopal bench together. Dr. Gleig had a wide reputation as an author and as editor of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, in which Dr. Walker assisted him, both as sub-editor and contributor. For range of scholarship, intellectual capacity, and vigour of character, bishop Gleig was probably the greatest of the post-Revolution prelates. Bishop Walker's accomplishments and culture, enlarged by foreign travel, gave him an

¹ Lawson, pp. 399-416; *Reports of Scot. Ep. Ch. Society.*

exceptional influence in the Church, more, it is said, than that of the bishops even before he was raised to the episcopate, an influence not unlike that which dean Ramsay exercised in after years.¹

Bishop Walker was succeeded in the primacy by bishop William Skinner of Aberdeen, and in the bishopric of Edinburgh by Dr. Terrot, the dean of the diocese, who was consecrated at Aberdeen, 2nd June 1841.²

Scottish Episcopalians had not become reconciled to the condition annexed to the Repeal Statutes of 1792, which excluded their clergy not only from preferment, but even from officiating, in the Church of England. This exclusion was felt to be a petty and vexatious restriction imposed at first for the Jacobite sins of their forefathers, and continued long after Jacobitism had ceased to be anything more than a sentiment. Before the death of the late primus steps had been taken for a removal of the invidious restriction. Correspondence was opened with the English bishops, and in 1840 a Bill was introduced into Parliament by the archbishop of Canterbury, which received the royal assent on the 23rd July. It was a niggardly instalment of justice, conferring on Scottish bishops and priests (deacons were omitted, apparently by oversight) the privilege of ministering for one Sunday, or two at the most, in any church or chapel of England. The Church of Ireland had not been included in the Act of George the Third, but by this Act the same prohibition that applied to England was now extended to Ireland. "Freedom broadens slowly down," and not until 1864 did it reach the Episcopal clergy in Scotland.

¹ Lawson, pp. 416-421; Walker's *Memoir of Gleig*, p. 380, and of *Jolly*, p. 153 note.

² MS. Register Coll. Bishops, ii. 111, 112.

In 1840 two lay friends of the Church, Mr. W. E. Gladstone and Mr. James Hope, had under consideration a scheme for establishing an Episcopal college "in which a secular education should be given, but the chief object should be the education of a Scottish priesthood." Next year it was submitted to the bishops, who were "startled by its very magnificence," and by no means sanguine of its success. Encouraged by the more sanguine laity they issued a pastoral letter addressed to "all faithful members of the Reformed Catholic Church," commending the object to their prayers and alms. When the project became publicly known, Presbyterian jealousy was aroused, and unreasonable opposition offered. There was not at this time a dissenting body in Scotland without a little theological seminary for the education of its ministers. The presbytery of Perth, ascertaining that the college was to be within their bounds, deemed that they were "specially called on to look to this matter"; and after a speech of five hours from one of the ministers they passed an overture to the General Assembly which was prudently shelved by that venerable body. They were in the thick of the disruption conflict "with their hands on each other's throats, and had no time to bestow on the aggressions of Puseyism when their own structure was reeling to its foundation."¹ Collegiate buildings were erected in Glenalmond, near Perth, dedicated in the name of the Holy Trinity; the first resident Warden being the accomplished scholar, Charles Wordsworth, afterwards bishop of St. Andrews. The college has had a somewhat chequered history, and not a few difficulties to overcome. Its pupils now number about a hundred and fifty, and many hundreds have been educated within its walls since the present marquis of Lothian entered as the first boy. Sir John Gladstone of

¹ See Bishop Charles Wordsworth's *Annals of my Life*, ii. 13.

Fasque laid the foundation stone, and his son, Mr. W. E. Gladstone, honoured the College Jubilee in 1891 by adding the foundation stone of an extension to the pile of buildings. From first to last the sum of about £100,000 has been spent on the material fabric of the college.¹

Fresh umbrage was taken by a section of the Presbyterians upon the occasion of the queen's visit to Scotland in 1842. The Scottish bishops joined their fellow-countrymen in demonstrations of loyalty, and for this they were as bitterly attacked in the public press as they had been twenty years before on George the Fourth's visit, and accused of the ambitious design to subvert Presbytery and promote Episcopacy. The jealousy was intensified by her majesty's attending an Episcopal service in Dalkeith palace when a guest of the duke of Buccleuch. These trivial incidents embittered for some years the relations between Presbyterians and Episcopalians. A small spark makes a great fire in Scotland when the wind blows from a sectarian quarter.²

When the schism was all but healed with the "qualified" congregations, only two of them remaining apart, a fresh rupture unhappily occurred in 1842. Mr. Drummond, a clergyman in Edinburgh, was in the habit of using extempore prayer instead of the liturgy at mission services, and as this practice was uncanonical, under the canons of those days, he was admonished by bishop Terrot and ultimately threatened with suspension. This he evaded by withdrawing from the communion of the Church and setting up an independent chapel. The liberty which Mr. Drummond then claimed is freely conceded now, the necessity for missions to the lapsed being better understood, and less

¹ MS. Reg. Coll. Bishops, ii. 115-117; Lawson, pp. 461-473; bishop Wordsworth's *Annals of my Life*, ii. chap. i. The Theological department of the college was, owing to the

accident of a fire, transferred to Edinburgh in 1875 and is now located in Coates Hall in that city.

² Lawson, pp. 422-425.

prejudice existing among Episcopalians against an extempore service of prayer. Episcopalians were then as unreasonably prejudiced against extempore prayer as Presbyterians were against a liturgy. Both sides have since learned much regarding the essentials and proprieties of public worship. The example of Mr. Drummond was soon after followed by Sir Wm. Dunbar, a clergyman in Aberdeen, who disclaimed the jurisdiction of bishop Skinner, and seceded with his congregation. For this he was censured by the bishop in diocesan synod, and excommunicated for contumacy. It was an unhappy dispute which would never have arisen had there been a little more mutual consideration and charity. Sir William continued to officiate as a separatist in Aberdeen, and when presented some years afterwards to an English benefice he made a submission to the Scottish bishops, upon which the censure was withdrawn. Mr. Miles, the incumbent of St. Jude's, Glasgow, espoused the cause of Sir Wm. Dunbar, with the result that his congregation also joined the secession.¹

In the Scottish Roman mission of this period bishop Gillis occupied the chief place, exercising an influence similar to that of bishop Hay in the last century. He was made coadjutor to the bishop of the eastern vicariate, and consecrated at Edinburgh in July 1838. Being a native of Montreal he was proficient in the French language, and found it serviceable to him in intercourse with the Catholics of France. Early in his episcopate he visited Paris and obtained from the French government what remained of the library of the Scots college, wrecked in the Revolution, and transferred the books and documents to Blairs college, on Deeside. He was a frequent preacher

¹ MS. Register College of Bishops, ii. 119-123, and 309-314; Thos. Stephen, iv. 600 and 607; Neale's *Life of Bishop Torrey*, pp. 194-205,

and 353; Blatch's *Life of Bishop Low*, pp. 265-274; Ross's *Memoir of Bishop Ewing*, pp. 105-108; *Scot. Eccles. Journal*, v. 165.

in the churches of Paris, and on one occasion (May 1857) he pronounced a panegyric on Joan of Arc in the cathedral of Orleans, for which service he received from the mayor of the city the heart of Henry II. of England, who died in 1189 at Chinon on the Loire.¹ He was not so successful in recovering for his mission the ancient Scots abbey of St. James at Ratisbon, which had formerly been a nursery of the Scottish priesthood. The Bavarian government insisted that the property had become secularised, and refused to restore it to its original purpose. They agreed, however, to pay a certain sum as compensation, and the money was spent in erecting the buildings of the Scots college at Rome. In lieu of the old Scots colleges at Paris and Douai, the French government undertook the expense of educating eighteen Scottish students in French seminaries, an arrangement which holds good to the present time. Bishop Gillis succeeded to the eastern vicariate on the death of Dr. Carruthers in 1852, and continued his active ministry for other twelve years. At Leith and Galashiels he established Fathers of "the Congregation of Mary Immaculate," introduced the Jesuits, and founded the Society of St. Vincent de Paul in Edinburgh, brought Sisters of Mercy from Limerick to superintend the female schools in his district, and in many other ways left his mark on Roman Catholicism in Scotland. For his scholarly gifts and social qualities he was held in high estimation by the citizens of Edinburgh.²

Ten years after the deposition of M^r. Leod Campbell, Mr. Wright, minister of Borthwick, was deposed on similar grounds by the Assembly of 1841. With this victim the zeal for Calvinistic orthodoxy was appeased within the Establishment for some years. The tide of party strife

¹ Gordon, *Scotichron.* iv. 488. convent, Edinburgh.
This relic is now in St. Margaret's

² Bellesheim, iv. 286-291.

between Moderate and Evangelical was then flowing too fast for the reputed heresy of Borthwick to make more than a ripple on the surface. Mr. Wright sank in the troubled waters of "the Conflict," and left not a trace behind.

Campbell's teaching produced results of a more permanent character among a section of the dissenters—the Secession Church, hitherto a stronghold of Calvinism. James Morrison, a licentiate of that body, became minister at Kilmarnock in 1839, and two years thereafter he was deposed "for testifying that Jesus Christ died for the sins of all men without distinction or exception." When sentence was given against him by the synod Morrison answered—"Moderator, I bow to the decision now pronounced upon me, but sooner let my right hand forget its cunning, and let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, than that this prohibition should prevent me from preaching the glorious gospel of Jesus Christ." His own congregation adhered faithfully to him, and the result of his deposition was the formation of another Presbyterian denomination, pronouncedly anti-Calvinistic and unfettered by Confessional doctrine. It adopted the name of the Evangelical Union Church, and is popularly known as "the Morrisonians." The body was formed in 1843, and now numbers about 100 congregations in Scotland. Dr. Morrison removed to Glasgow in 1851, and there for forty years he exercised a wide influence by his life and preaching, and a still wider by his theological writings. In the spring of 1893 an address, significant of the theological change, was presented to him bearing 1946 signatures of ministers, elders, and other members of the United Presbyterian Church (a section of which had deposed him), congratulating him on the jubilee of the denomination he had founded.¹

¹ Dr. Morrison died at Glasgow in November 1893, and on the obelisk

The chief interest of the ecclesiastical history of Scotland in the 'thirties and 'forties did not, however, lie in the bypaths of Episcopacy, Romanism, and Dissent, but in the highways of Presbyterianism. The Ten Years' Conflict had nearly run its course, and the battle within the Establishment was every year becoming fiercer. The General Assembly met in May 1839, a few days after the House of Lords had dismissed its appeal in the Auchterarder case. The Tron Church was crowded from floor to ceiling, so intense was the interest as to the probable policy of the non-intrusion leaders in face of the adverse decision. Three motions were submitted: one by Dr. Cook, the leader of the Moderates, who proposed that presbyteries should proceed in the settlement of ministers as they had done before the Veto Act was passed, seeing it was now declared to be illegal; another was proposed by Dr. Chalmers in an eloquent speech of three hours, to the effect "that the principle of non-intrusion cannot be abandoned, and that no presentee shall be forced upon a parish contrary to the will of the congregation." Dr. Muir of St. Stephen's, Edinburgh, Moderator of the previous Assembly and leader of the middle party, intervened as a peacemaker with a third resolution, according to which both the presbytery and "the mind of the people" were to have a voice in the settlement of a minister. In the long and stormy debate which followed, Mr. Candlish, of St. George's, Edinburgh, made his first appearance as a speaker in the Assembly, and was at once recognised as a leader in the non-intrusion ranks. Upon the vote being taken in the early summer

erected, 28th September 1895, by his grave in the Necropolis, the inscription bears record that "he was spared to see his views of Divine truth almost universally accepted in his native land."—*Scotsman*, 14th November

1893 and 30th September 1895. The denomination is now (1896) negotiating a union with the Independent or Congregational Body which seems likely to be effected.

morning the motions of Dr. Muir and Dr. Cook were both lost, the numbers in favour of Dr. Chalmers being on the first division 197 to 161, and on the second 204 to 155. Next day, when the committee was being appointed in terms of Dr. Chalmers's motion, Dr. Cook declined to serve on it ; and when the name of lord Dalhousie, the future Governor-General of India, was proposed, he at once rose and requested that his name should be removed, not only from the committee but from the membership of the Assembly. He said he would not be a member in the governing body of an Established Church which had set itself without any sufficient grounds to defy the law of the land ; and he added that by the vote of the previous day, and more especially by the speech of Dr. Chalmers (as he afterwards explained), the Church had lost the allegiance of many of her firmest friends, and "had already rung out her knell as the established Church of Scotland." Thereupon he left the Assembly.¹

The decision of this Assembly shaped the ultimate issue of the conflict, and materially lessened the chances of compromise. The majority were determined upon asserting at all hazards their claims to "spiritual independence," regardless alike of the decisions of the Court of Session, and of the House of Lords to which they had appealed.

This Assembly of 1839 which so far drove in the wedge of disruption also engaged in the more laudable work of re-union with a small body of Presbyterians, the Burgher Synod of original Seceders, known as the Old Light Burghers, who had been in secession for a century. They were now formally received back into the Establishment, and it was agreed to assign to their ministers and

¹ Bryce's *Ten Years of the Church*, i. 87-100 ; Buchanan's *Ten Years' Conflict*, ii. 20-60 ; Hanna's *Memoirs of Dr. Chalmers*, iv. 105-115.

kirk-sessions separate territorial districts, as had been done with the Chapels of Ease—a step which the Moderates opposed as being *ultra vires* of the Assembly.¹ The Act of incorporation stated that “the members of the Associate Synod do heartily concur with us in holding the great principle of our ecclesiastical establishment, and the duty of acknowledging God in our national as well as our individual capacity”—a statement which showed the prevailing opinion of the Assembly on this subject. Mr. Candlish, in moving reunion with the Seceders, expressed the hope that it was “the beginning of that ingathering by which the Church of Scotland might yet be the Church of all the people of the land,” a remarkable utterance to be made on the brink of the biggest disruption that has befallen the Presbyterian Establishment.²

Before the Auchterarder case was closed other disputed parochial settlements had enlarged the area of agitation and intensified the strife. The aged minister of Lethendy, in the presbytery of Dunkeld, applied in 1835 for an assistant and successor, and the Crown, being patron, presented the then assistant, Mr. Clark, with the parishioners' approval. When the presbytery met to moderate in the call, the people, having meanwhile changed their minds, protested against his induction, and the presbytery accordingly refused to proceed. Mr. Clark appealed to the Assembly, which confirmed the action of the presbytery. The case was complicated at this stage by the Crown, for some unknown reason, presenting another minister, Mr. Kessen, to the benefice, whereupon Mr. Clark in 1837 procured an interdict from the Court of Session against his rival's appointment. The presbytery then applied to the

¹ The subsequent decision of the Court of Session in the Stewarton case showed that they were legally right in their contention.

² *Acts of Assembly*, pp. 1094, 1095; M'Kerrow, pp. 613-617; Bryce, i. 99; Buchanan, ii. 62.

Assembly for advice, and they were ordered by its commission to induct Mr. Kessen in defiance of the interdict. On the 21st August 1838 they met at Lethendy, and, regardless of consequences, ordained and inducted Mr. Kessen to the parish. For this grave offence the eight members of presbytery were summoned before the Court of Session in June 1839. The offenders pleaded that they had acted in obedience to ecclesiastical judicatories which they were bound in conscience to obey. The general impression was that they would be imprisoned for contempt of Court, and five of the judges are understood to have been inclined to that course, but after four days' interval the lord president intimated that the ends of justice would be sufficiently served, for the present, by a sentence of censure, adding, however, that if they or any other presbytery should repeat the offence the breach of interdict would be followed by imprisonment.¹

The next disputed settlement was in the parish of Marnoch, in the presbytery of Strathbogie. The early complications were similar to those in Lethendy. The first presentee, Mr. Edwards, was objected to by the parishioners, only four of them signing the call. The presbytery consulted synod and Assembly, and the Assembly of 1838, taking their stand upon the Veto Act, directed the presbytery to reject the presentee, which they accordingly did. The trustees of the patron, the earl of Fife, then presented Mr. Hendrie, for whom the people had formerly petitioned. Mr. Edwards applied to the Court of Session, and received an interdict against the

¹ Mr. Clark subsequently raised an action against the presbytery for having illegally excluded him from the parish of Lethendy, and obtained damages of some thousand pounds, which were considerably met by the generosity of the church at large.

After the Disruption, he was deprived of his licence, for drunkenness, by the Established Assembly. — Buchanan, ii. 80-98; Bryce, ii. 73-80; Hanna's *Memoirs of Dr. Chalmers*, iv. 126-131.

presbytery's taking Mr. Hendrie upon trials. So far the case was similar to that of Lethendy, but it presently developed a difference. The members of the Strathbogie presbytery resolved by a majority "to delay all procedure until the matter in dispute be finally determined."¹ The minority of non-intrusionists appealed to the synod and from the synod to the Assembly, by whom it was remitted to the commission.² The commission ordered the presbytery "to suspend proceedings in the settlement of the parish," while the Court of Session (the House of Lords having meanwhile decided against the legality of the Veto Act) ordered them to take Mr. Edwards on trials and admit him to the benefice, if found qualified. The presbytery were in a dilemma between the two courts. They had to choose between a bill for damages if they did not induct the presentee, and a sentence of suspension or deposition if they did. On the 4th December they met and sustained Mr. Edwards's call, appointed his trials, and reported their proceedings to the commission. A week after, they stood at the bar of the commission, and were then and there suspended from the office of the ministry by a vote of 121 to 14, Mr. Candlish moving their suspension in an impassioned speech.

The suspended ministers protested against the sentence as illegal, and immediately applied to the Court of Session to interdict the minority of the presbytery from publishing it within their bounds. Interdict was granted; which forbade any church, churchyard, or school in Strathbogie to be used for any purpose by ministers unsanctioned by

¹ The decision had not yet been given by the House of Lords in the Auchterarder case.

² "The commission may be popularly described as a committee of the whole House which meets

immediately after the close of the General Assembly, and at stated periods during the year."—Charteris in his *Life of Dr. Robertson*, p. 75, note.

the presbytery. But the minority were not to be baffled by interdicts. Accompanied by several of the non-intrusion leaders they intimated the suspension of their brethren in every one of the parishes. The result was a second interdict—known as “the extended interdict”—debaring the deputies of the commission from preaching in any parish within the presbytery of Strathbogie—a stretch of authority on the part of the civil court which even many of the Moderates condemned. The suspended ministers were before the Assembly in May 1841, and refused to resile from their position. Meanwhile Mr. Edwards had raised an action in the Court of Session to compel the presbytery, which had already sustained his call, to induct him into the parish, or be held liable in damages of £10,000. On the 21st January 1841 his induction took place. The church of Marnoch was crowded with parishioners; their agent was present, and protested against the induction; the people supported him by their voices, and when foiled in their protestation they left in a body. The ordination and induction then proceeded in the solemn stillness of an empty church.¹

The ordaining ministers were tried for contumacy by the Assembly in May 1841. The libel accused them of “denying the truth of God’s Word, and disowning the Lord Jesus as only King and Head of His Church.” Dr. Chalmers and Dr. Cook argued on opposite sides; Mr. Cunningham supported the non-intrusion views of Dr. Chalmers, and Mr. Robertson of Ellon,² now coming to the front as a speaker, answered Mr. Cunningham. Dr. Chalmers is said to have remarked that the debate between these two divines was “the greatest display of intellectual

¹ Mr. Edwards died in 1848, having lived down, in a few years, the hostility of a whole parish.

² Afterwards professor of Church

History in Edinburgh University, and the zealous advocate of parochial endowments.

gladiatorship he had ever seen."¹ On the motion of Dr. Chalmers the seven ministers of Strathbogie were deposed, and next day Mr. Edwards was declared to be no longer a licentiate of the Church, his ordination and induction as parish minister being altogether ignored.²

The gage of battle was thus boldly flung down by the Assembly to the highest legal courts in the land. The Moderates, though defeated, were nothing daunted, and once more betook them to their house of refuge, the Court of Session, for a decree to annul the Assembly's sentence of deposition. It was duly granted, and served upon the Assembly. Great commotion it made, and much excited discussion. Ultimately a resolution was passed "to lay before the Queen in Council the insult which had been offered to the Assembly."

The crisis was now acute. The agitation which had begun in the remote parish of Marnoch swelled like one of its own mountain streams, as it rolled on through the presbytery of Strathbogie and the synod of Moray and the General Assembly, until it invaded the secular precincts of the Court of Session and the House of Lords. Finally, it overflowed like a flood all the northern land. Public meetings were held both in large towns and in rural districts; at kirk and market, on Sunday and week day, little was heard but the din of the non-intrusion controversy. Repeated deputations of leading ministers and laymen had gone to London, soliciting in vain the intervention of the government—first that of lord Melbourne, and afterwards Sir Robert Peel's. Four different bills had been

¹ Charteris's *Life of Dr. Robertson*, p. 136.

² For the Strathbogie case, see Bryce's *Ten Years*, ii. 78 *et seq.*; Buchanan's *Ten Years' Conflict*, ii. 225 *et seq.*; Hanna's *Memoirs of Dr. Chalmers*, iv. 213 *et seq.*; Charteris's

Life of Robertson, pp. 103-175. There were other disputed settlements before the Assembly from the parishes of Kilmarnock, Stranraer, Cambusnethan, Culsalmond, and elsewhere, which it is unnecessary to detail.

introduced into Parliament to extricate the Kirk from its difficulties, but all from various causes had been dropped. Lord Aberdeen had, early in May 1840, proposed a healing measure, but the Assembly rejected it as insufficient. In May 1841 the duke of Argyll introduced a bill on patronage which would substantially have legalised the Veto, but it disappeared with the Whig ministry. Sir George Sinclair in the same year revived lord Aberdeen's bill, adding a clause which empowered the presbytery to reject a presentee if the objections to him were such as "to preclude the prospect of the presentee's usefulness in that particular parish." The clause came to be known as the *liberum arbitrium*, but it failed to satisfy the non-intrusionists. Forty members in the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr expressed their approval of it, and the dissentients humorously dubbed them "the forty thieves." In the end of May 1842, Mr. Campbell of Monzie, M.P. for Argyllshire, made a fourth attempt in a measure resembling the duke of Argyll's, but the bill was withdrawn on intimation from the Speaker that, as it affected the Crown's rights of patronage in Scotland, the consent of her majesty was necessary to its further procedure.

Before the introduction of Mr. Campbell's bill the Assembly had met in May 1842. After a debate on patronage and a resolution in favour of its entire abolition, the Assembly adopted "the Claim, Declaration, and Protest,"¹ drawn by Mr. Dunlop, the legal adviser of the non-intrusionists, who passed among his friends as "the modern Warriston." It came to be known as the "Claim of Right," as supposed to resemble the document so called at the time of the Revolution Settlement. The Claim was handed to the marquis of Bute, the commissioner,

¹ Given at length in Hanna's *Memoirs of Dr. Chalmers*, vol. iv. Appendix C.

who repudiated its sentiments, while consenting to forward it to the government.

Before an answer was received, a meeting known as the "Convocation," and attended by 465 ministers, headed by Dr. Chalmers, was held in the Roxburgh church, Edinburgh, on the 17th November 1842. After a week's deliberation it was agreed to petition the government for a redress of their grievances, and failing this, "to tender the resignation of those civil advantages which they can no longer hold in consistency with the free and full exercise of their spiritual functions, and to cast themselves on such provision as God in His providence may afford."¹ As many as 354 ministers pledged themselves to this resolution. When Dr. Chalmers was informed of the number of signatories, he exclaimed—"Then we are more than Gideon's army—a most hopeful omen."

Sir James Graham, on the 4th January 1843, intimated to Dr. Welsh, the moderator, that the government could not concede the Assembly's claim. A meeting of commission was immediately called to consider the situation. Dr. Cook objected to the presence of Chapel ministers now that the decision in the Stewarton case had declared their position in Church courts to be illegal; and being overruled in this he and his friends left the meeting. Mr. Clelland, minister at Stewarton in Ayrshire, one of the Seceders recently received into the Establishment, had been assigned a *quoad sacra* district by the presbytery of Irvine. The heritors of the parish objected, and applied to the Court of Session, which decided by eight judges to five that the Chapel Act of 1834 was illegal. As the Veto and the Chapel Acts were thus both condemned by the civil courts, it was felt to be useless for the Assembly

¹ See Dr. Chalmers's address to the Convocation, Hanna's *Memoirs*, vol. iv. Appendix D, pp. 307-318.

to prolong the contention. As a last resource they again petitioned the government. Mr. Fox Maule laid the petition before the House of Commons on the 7th March, and lord Campbell introduced the subject in the House of Lords, but the government resolutely refused to intervene. There was nothing therefore left but secession. For this the country had been well prepared by deputations that had visited hundreds of parishes, organised committees, collected money, and circulated many thousand papers and pamphlets, in which the views of the non-intrusionists were popularly stated.

The Assembly of 1843 was anxiously awaited. It met on the 18th May in St. Andrew's church, Edinburgh.¹ The marquis of Bute was again commissioner, and Dr. Welsh, the retiring moderator, took the chair. After prayer he addressed the Assembly : " Fathers and brethren, according to the usual form of procedure this is the time for making up the roll. But in consequence of certain proceedings affecting our rights and privileges, proceedings which have been sanctioned by her majesty's government and by the legislature of the country ; and more especially in respect that there has been an infringement on the liberties of our Constitution, so that we could not now constitute this court without a violation of the terms of the union between Church and State in this land, as now authoritatively declared, I must protest against our proceeding further. The reasons that have led me to this conclusion are fully set forth in the document which I hold in my hand, and which, with permission of the House, I will now proceed to read." The document, which was signed by 203 members of the Assembly, set forth

¹ Many of the members from both sides had met on the previous day at the commissioner's *levée* in Holyrood. It was reckoned ominous that the

portrait of William of Orange fell with a crash on the floor. The voice of an interpreter was heard, " There goes the Revolution Settlement."

the various usurpations and encroachments of the civil power upon the rights and liberties of the Church. Patronage was the original bone of contention, but the claim to absolute spiritual independence was the ultimate ground of secession, and that claim, in the opinion of Free Churchmen, remains unsatisfied by the later abolition of patronage. After reading the protest, Dr. Welsh laid it upon the table, bowed to the commissioner, and left the church, followed by Dr. Chalmers, Dr. Gordon, Candlish, M'Donald, Cunningham, Dunlop, and more than 400 ministers of the Establishment. They proceeded in a body to a hall at Canonmills, and as the procession passed through the streets it was watched by thousands of spectators of all classes amidst manifestations of the profoundest sympathy. It was truly a noble spectacle, on the part of many a magnanimous sacrifice, and worthy of the admiration which it elicited both at home and abroad.¹ Whether the "Disruption" was justifiable or not it is unnecessary for a historian to say, his office being rather to chronicle than to criticise, especially in the face of strongly diverging testimony from equally credible witnesses.² But disruption had come, with all its consequences, both for good and evil, to Scotland.³

¹ Lord Jeffrey was reading in his room when a friend burst in upon him with the news—"Well, what do you think of it? More than four hundred of them are actually out." Jeffrey rose to his feet and threw aside his book, exclaiming—"I am proud of my country."

² Dr. Bryce in his *Ten Years of the Church*, and Dr. Buchanan in his *Ten Years' Conflict*, describe, each from his own standpoint, the burning incidents of the decade 1833-43. In their interpretations and comments it is sometimes difficult to realise that the two divines are dealing with the same events. Dr. Bryce makes one

suggestive comment on the issues of the Assembly in 1843: "Had the dominant party been encouraged to persist in their course of defying the law, and maintaining the illegal acts of the Church, the whole Moderate minority would of necessity have been treated at this Assembly, as had been the bishops in 1638, and deposed or excommunicated."—ii. 368.

³ For details see the second vols. of Bryce and Buchanan, the fourth vol. of Hanna's *Memoirs of Chalmers*, and Turner's *Scott. Secession of 1843*; Charteris's *Life of Robertson*, sub 1843; Brown's *Annals of the Disruption*, 1843.

Of the 1203 ministers in the Established Church at the Disruption, 752 remained and 451 seceded. Of the 752, 681 were parish ministers, and 71 chapel ministers; of the 451, 289 were parish ministers, and 162 chapel ministers. Fully a third of the ministers had thus seceded, and the number of elders and laity that followed them was reckoned to be of the same proportion.¹

The Established Assembly elected principal Macfarlane to the moderator's chair, and with attenuated numbers proceeded to business. The Veto Act was repudiated as illegal, as was also the deposition of the Strathbogie ministers, who were welcomed back to the Assembly. The Chapel Act, and the Act of 1839, for the admission of Seceders to the status of parish ministers, were declared to have been "incompetently passed," and were "of necessity repealed." The Protest which Dr. Welsh had left on the table was then remitted to a committee to answer. It never was answered, and Free Churchmen naturally exulted over "the unanswered and unanswerable Protest." The immediate filling of 451 vacant church and chapel charges was a more serious undertaking. Many of the ablest men in the Church—Chalmers, Welsh, Cunningham, Gordon, Candlish, and Guthrie—had been members of the Edinburgh presbytery, and their equals were not likely to be found by a visit to the market-place. The same difficulty was experienced throughout Scotland, and the ordeal was severe for the shattered and all but shipwrecked Establishment. But while some unsuitable appointments were made, as was inevitable, the new incumbents were, on the whole, little inferior in character and attainments to the average parish

¹ The above are the figures in Turner's *Secession of 1843*, p. 357. In Chambers's *Encyclopedia*, iv. 812,

it is stated that 729 ministers remained and 474 seceded.

minister.¹ Within a few months (August 1843) lord Aberdeen succeeded in passing a bill—the Scotch Benefices Act—which gave greater power to presbyteries and people in the settling of ministers; and in less than another year Sir James Graham virtually legalised the Chapel Act by a bill which became law in July 1844. These two Acts, if passed earlier, would in all probability have averted the disruption of the Establishment.²

In the Free Assembly Dr. Chalmers was by acclamation voted into the moderator's chair. The task before it was even more formidable than that which the Established Assembly had to face—to plant a new church, manse, and school in every parish of Scotland. In six months they raised for churches, schools, and sustentation fund £270,000; by 1848 they had built 700 churches at a cost of half a million, besides raising £120,000 for manses, and large sums annually for stipends.³ The whole work was a marvel of zeal and energy unprecedented, and of financial skill approaching to genius. To Dr. Chalmers belongs the lion's share of the honour. He had already done yeoman service within the Establishment by the planting of 200 Chapels of Ease in a few years; and now he applied himself with the same indomitable courage to a still more arduous task. Much of it was accomplished before his sudden and unexpected death on the 30th May 1847. Chalmers was a man of the noblest mould, a born leader of men, and the grandest figure in the Disruption epoch.

The decade which witnessed the disruption of established Presbyterianism is also memorable for the union of two dissenting Presbyterian bodies, the United Associate Synod and the Relief Synod, the Churches of Erskine

¹ This was the opinion of Dr. Grub, a contemporary. See his *History*, iv. 233.

² Bryce, ii. 384, 396-412; Char-

ter's *Life of Robertson*, p. 187.

³ Walker, *Chapters*, etc., pp. 27, 36, 47, 50.

and Gillespie, or rather the sections of them known as the New-Light Burghers and Anti-Burghers.¹ The growth of voluntaryism in both communions largely helped to bring them into closer practical sympathy, and to foster the desire for ecclesiastical fellowship. Negotiations for union had begun as early as 1836, and on the 13th of May 1847 they issued in the formation of one body under the name of "The United Presbyterian Church."²

The Old Light Anti-Burghers, of whom Dr. M'Crie, the historian, had been the leading representative, still remained in their isolation, as Wordsworth said of Milton, "like a star that dwelt apart." They formed one of several deputations to the first Free Church Assembly in 1843, congratulating them upon achieving their spiritual independence while remaining loyal to the principle of the national recognition of religion. In 1844 a committee was formed to consider terms of union with the Free Church. Unexpected difficulties arose. "The chief obstacle to the contemplated alliance was whether or not the continued obligation of the National Covenants on posterity should be insisted on by Seceders as a fundamental article of union." It was not until June 1852 that the proposal for union was carried by the narrow majority of one vote, 18 ministers and 14 elders being favourable to union, while 13 ministers and 18 elders were opposed to it. Dr. M'Crie, son of the historian, was the prime mover for union among the Seceders, and Dr. Candlish, now the recognised leader of the Free Church, proposed their reception into its fold. The minority remained in their isolation—Seceders still.³

¹ The Old Lights, both Burghers and Anti-Burghers, adhered to the original Establishment principles of their founders.

² M'Kerrow, pp. 700-705; *Minutes of the Assoc. Synod*, May 1846, pp. 40, 41; *Proceedings of the Synod of*

U.P. Church, 1847, pp. 7 *et seq.*

³ See *Annals and Statistics of the Original Secession Church*, by Dr. David Scott, pp. 177-238; and *Chapters from Hist. of Free Church*, by Dr. Norman Walker, pp. 228-232.

For some years the Episcopal Church had been governed by six bishops. In 1847 the number was increased to seven, not, however, from the poetic idea of a heptarchy, Asiatic or Anglo-Saxon, but from the most prosaic of reasons. Bishop Low had the charge of four sees (besides the incumbency of Pittenweem), and feeling the weight of years he wished to resign Argyll and the Isles, while retaining Moray and Ross. He made an offer to endow the bishopric of Argyll on condition of being allowed to nominate the first bishop. The mediæval bishop, John of Dunkeld, had made a similar offer to the Pope, which was accepted, and the see of Argyll was severed from Dunkeld about the year 1200. But there was this important difference between the two transactions, that while bishop John's nominee was an expert in Gaelic, and appointed for that reason, bishop Low's nominee was innocent of the native tongue. His proposal, generous in itself, seemed to his colleagues to savour of simony. They would accept the endowment, but not the conditions; and to this the donor agreed. The bishop's intended nominee was Alexander Ewing, presbyter at Forres, and he was elected at Oban by the clergy of Argyll, in October 1846, by a majority of one over dean Paterson, incumbent of Ballachulish. Objections were made to the election of Mr. Ewing, and his consecration was deferred.¹

The see of Brechin became vacant by the death of the amiable bishop Moir in August 1847, and the clergy elected as his successor Alexander Penrose Forbes, then vicar of St. Saviour's, Leeds, and formerly incumbent at Stonehaven, by a large majority over the votes in favour of William Henderson, incumbent at Arbroath. The bishops-elect of Argyll and Brechin were consecrated at Aberdeen on the feast of SS. Simon and Jude, 1847,

¹ Ross's *Memoir of Bishop Ewing*, pp. 114-118.

Mr. Wordsworth, the warden of Trinity college, being the preacher.

The death of Dr. Russell, bishop of Glasgow, occurred next year, in April 1848.¹ Dean Ramsay of Edinburgh was chosen as his successor, and, upon his declining the office, Walter John Trower, rector of Wiston, Sussex, and Robert Eden, rector of Leigh, Essex, were nominated. Mr. Trower was elected by eight votes to seven, and was consecrated at Glasgow on the feast of St. Matthew, 1848, Mr. Eden preaching the sermon.² Dr. Trower was an urbane and generous prelate, but less liberal-minded than he was liberal-handed in the administration of his diocese. He was the first Englishman appointed to a Scottish bishopric without having previously ministered in Scotland. After ten years' occupancy of the see, during half of which he was non-resident, he at last resigned it, his northern experience no doubt making him feel with his countrymen, Whitfield and Wesley, that the Scots were a peculiar people.³

The fruitless attempt made by the non-jurors in the last century to open communion with the Orthodox Eastern Church, was repeated in the middle of the present century by the rev. William Palmer, a deacon in the English Church, and fellow of Magdalen, Oxford. The project has a peculiar history from beginning to end. A Russian lady, the wife of prince Galitzin, upon renouncing the communion of the Eastern Church had, with her daughter, been received as converts into the English Church by the chaplain at Geneva. Mr. Palmer resented this action of the English chaplain, on the ground that inter-communion subsisted between the Churches, and

¹ For account of bishop Russell and his writings, see Walker's *Three Churchmen*.

² Minute-Book of Glasgow and

Galloway Diocese; *Scot. Mag.* i. 492.

³ Bishop Trower was appointed to the see of Gibraltar in 1863.

that the idea of conversion from the one to the other was inadmissible. This raised the broader question as to the right to claim the Holy Communion in the Episcopal Church. Bishop Luscombe in Paris supported Mr. Palmer, and sent him to Russia with letters addressed to the Holy Governing Synod, requesting that they would admit him to communion. The Eastern bishops were as uncompromising as their predecessors of the last century, and demanded that the applicant should say anathema to the confession of the British Church, and be received as a convert from heterodoxy. Mr. Palmer committed himself to several anathemas, but he refused to anathematise the Anglican Church and the Thirty-nine Articles as a whole.¹ In September 1846 bishop Luscombe sent Mr. Palmer to represent him at an Episcopal synod in Edinburgh, but the Scottish bishops declined to receive him in that capacity. Mr. Palmer thereupon wrote and distributed a bulky volume entitled *An Appeal to the Scottish Bishops and Clergy, and, generally, to the Church of their Communion*. So important did the subject appear to Scottish Episcopalians, that it was gravely discussed by the diocesan synods, and afterwards by an Episcopal synod held in September 1849. In the former the Appeal had a mixed reception; by the latter it was dismissed as not having "legitimately arisen," the bishops adding that "the existing documents of this Church sufficiently show her care to guard the sanctity of Holy Communion from the intrusion of unworthy applicants." This practically ended the business in Scotland. Churchmen of the present day may well wonder how it could have excited the interest and received the attention which it did. Mr. Palmer subsequently helped to bring ridicule upon his enterprise

¹ This incident led to his being distinguished from an eminent Oxford namesake by the prefix "Anathema Palmer."

by deserting the Anglican communion, not for the Greek, but for the Roman Church.¹

The decision in the "Gorham case," which was pronounced by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on the 8th March 1850, excited no little alarm in Scotland as well as in England. The judgment reversed the sentence of the Court of Arches, and affirmed that "the doctrine held by Mr. Gorham is not contrary or repugnant to the declared doctrine of the Church of England." Many English churchmen challenged the authority of the court, as well as the soundness of this particular judgment, maintaining that the court had no rightful jurisdiction in matters of faith and discipline. The bishop of Exeter (Dr. Philpotts), who had refused to institute Mr. Gorham to the vicarage of Bramford-Speke on account of his denial of baptismal regeneration, protested against the judgment, and, in a letter to the archbishop of Canterbury, told him that if he, the archbishop, obeyed the monitions of the court, he would be "a favourer and supporter of Mr. Gorham's heresies." He added—"I protest, in conclusion, that I cannot without sin—and by God's grace I will not—hold communion with him, be he who he may, who shall so abuse the high commission which he bears." Mr. Gorham was instituted to the living in accordance with the decree of the Privy Council. The whole proceedings opened the eyes of English churchmen to the political thralldom of the national Church and the Erastian usurpation of the State. Much controversy followed, and the loyalty of many Anglo-Catholics was seriously shaken by what seemed an unworthy submission to the sentence of a secular court ignoring a fundamental article of the faith.

¹ MS. Register Coll. of Bishops, pp. 224-263; Ross's *Memoir of Bishop Ewing*, pp. 162-165; Bp. C. Wordsworth's *Annals of my Life*, ii. 74-82.

Among Scottish Episcopalians the feeling prevailed that, owing to the inter-communion between the two Churches, they were somehow compromised by the Gorham decision. Memorials were presented from several diocesan synods to the College of Bishops on the subject. In an Episcopal synod held at Aberdeen, 19th April 1850, the bishops answered: "We do not consider the sentence as having any authority to bind us, or to modify in any way the doctrine which we and the Episcopal Church in Scotland hold, and have always taught, respecting the nature of baptismal grace." The synod at the same time restated the doctrine from the words of Scripture and the formularies of the Church.¹

In the same Episcopal synod the Prayer Book, recently authorised by the bishop of St. Andrews, came up for consideration. The policy of issuing a Service Book on the authority of the Church collectively—the Irish Church has done so since her disestablishment—had something to be said in its favour; the publishing on the authority of a single bishop of a Book, which was "neither in law nor in fact what it professed to be," had no such justification. The synod condemned the publication of the Book, and ordered it to be suppressed, at the same time enjoining the bishop of St. Andrews to recall his recommendation of it. Bishop Torry was not readily brought to reason. Aged as he was, he battled bravely for his Book, addressing to his colleagues a sharp rejoinder, in which he deprecated "the assumption of

¹ MS. Register of Coll. of Bishops, ii. 199-202; *Scot. Mag.* iii. 246-249; Irving's *Annals*, pp. 294, 326; Neale's *Life of Bishop Torry*, pp. 357, 358; Bishop Wordsworth's *Annals of my Life*, ii. 82-84; Ross's *Memoir of Bishop Ewing*, pp. 172-176. Bishop Ewing, in a contemporary letter, writes—"I do not think we are

affected by the Gorham decision. The Catholic Church has always held that some special benefit was attached to the due administration of the rite of baptism; and so far I am not prepared to dissent from the teaching of the Catholic Church, and take part with the Zuinglians."—Ross's *Memoir*, p. 176.

anything like archiepiscopal authority." This necessitated another Episcopal synod in Edinburgh, on the 5th September, when the following resolution was adopted: "The synod declares solemnly that the book has no synodical or canonical authority, and is not what it professes to be, 'The Book of Common Prayer, according to the use of the Church of Scotland.'" The synod also addressed a circular letter to the English archbishops and bishops, assuring them that "neither the College of Bishops, nor the Church at large, was answerable for its publication." Bishop Forbes of Brechin dissented both from the decision and the circular.¹

On the application of bishop Low for a coadjutor, a mandate was issued to the clergy of Moray and Ross in October 1850. Bishop Ewing was invited by a majority of the clergy to become coadjutor and successor to his old friend. Upon his declining to sever himself from the "Ergadians," James Mackay, incumbent at Inverness, and Robert Eden, rector of Leigh, Essex, were nominated. The votes being equal, the College of Bishops ordered a fresh election. Bishop Low then resigned, and on the next election in January, Mr. Eden had a majority of votes, and was consecrated, at Edinburgh, the 9th March 1851.²

The consecration, in December 1850, of the cathedral of St. Ninian, Perth, marked a new era in the Episcopal Church, though the edifice itself in its then incipient proportions was humble enough. It was the first cathedral built in Britain since the Reformation, with the exception

¹ MS. Register of Coll. of Bishops, ii. 203-221, and 240; Neale's *Life of Bishop Torry*, pp. 273-293; Ross's *Memoir of Bishop Ewing*, pp. 180, 181; Bp. Wordsworth's *Annals of my Life*, ii. 84-87.

² MS. Register Coll. of Bishops, ii. 223-226; Blatch's *Life of Bishop Low*, pp. 342-345; Ross's *Memoir of Bishop Ewing*, p. 170; *Scot. Mag.* iii. 532-536; *Scot. Eccles. Journal*, i. 10, 36, 57-59.

of St. Paul's, London. The growth of the Church and the influence of the Oxford movement prompted a higher ideal of liturgic worship, which was fittingly realised in the rehabilitation of the cathedral or mother church with its frequent Eucharists and daily round of praise and prayer. Other three cathedrals—Inverness, Cumbrae, and Edinburgh—have since been erected, but St. Ninian's bears the palm as pioneer in the middle of the century.¹

What was called "the papal aggression," in 1850, raised a storm of indignation in England and Scotland, which at the present day would be deemed highly superfluous. When pope Pius IX. in that year² set up a Roman hierarchy in England, intruding bishops into sees already occupied by the national episcopate, the law was, or could be made, sufficiently strong to deal with the aggressors. And it did deal with them, legislating in a panic, a state never favourable to wise legislation. It was rumoured that a similar papal measure was in store for Scotland—it came in 1878—and bishop Forbes of Brechin was induced to indite a formal protest against "the intrusion of a strange prelate into an already occupied see as a high crime, violating the great law of unity, and rending the vesture of Christ." In an address to his clergy, he protested not less earnestly against "the deliberate language of hatred, indignation, and scorn, lately used against the papal aggression, as essentially sinful." The bill, as first drafted, would have excluded the Scottish bishops equally with the Roman Catholic from the use of territorial titles. On a petition to Parliament from the Episcopal synod, February 1851, a clause was inserted in the Ecclesiastical Titles Assump-

¹ Thos. Stephen, iv. 616-618; Neale's *Life of Bishop Torry*, pp. 307 *et seq.*

² The Papal Bull was "given at

St. Peter's, Rome," on the 24th September 1850. See *History of the Restoration of the Catholic Hierarchy in England*, 1871.

tion Act, which exempted the Scottish bishops from any of the provisions of the statute, while conferring on them no legal title to the use of the ancient see names.¹

The agitation for the admission of the laity into synods had fallen asleep since the death of dean Skinner. Mr. Gladstone awoke it to new life by a letter "On the Functions of Laymen in the Church," addressed to primus Skinner in 1852. He remarked upon the disadvantages under which the Church laboured from the absence of any authorised co-operation of the laity, and he suggested as a just and expedient reform that a third chamber, consisting of lay representatives, should be added to the legislative synod. On this point he made suggestions to the following effect:—First, that the synod or assembly for legislation should consist of three chambers, for bishops, clergy, and laity respectively. Secondly, the lay representative system should be based exclusively upon an ecclesiastical qualification, both electors and elected having been communicants for a prescribed period before the election. Thirdly, the system of lay representation in synods should be gradually introduced, beginning with congregational organisation, and rising through the diocesan synod to the legislative assembly. Fourthly, the initiative of all legislation should rest with the bishops exclusively, and the other chambers should have the right to approach them by way of petition only.²

Mr. Gladstone's letter raised the important question above the region of party politics. It excited very deep interest both among the clergy and laity, although the conservative instincts of the clergy made them view the proposal with some reserve. It could not have escaped

¹ MS. Register Coll. of Bishops, ii. 228-237; Irving's *Annals*, pp. 310-333 *passim*; Ross's *Memoir of Bishop Ewing*, p. 188; *Scot. Eccles.*

Journal, i. 58-61; *Scot. Mag. new series*, i. 90-92, 146-149.

² The above is the substance of Mr. Gladstone's letter.

the observation of one so conversant with Scottish ecclesiastical affairs as Mr. Gladstone was, that the strength of the Presbyterian system did not lie in its ministerial parity, but in the official co-operation of the laity in its several courts, from the kirk-session to the Assembly, and that, in this respect, the polity of the Episcopal Church in Scotland was singularly defective.

The Episcopal synod considered the proposal at a meeting in Edinburgh, the 20th April 1852, and passed by a majority the following resolution: "That the admission of the laity into ecclesiastical synods, under certain conditions, and to speak and vote therein on a large class of ecclesiastical questions, is not inconsistent with the Word of God, and is not contrary to that pure constitution of the Church, to which it has been the special privilege of the Church in Scotland to bear testimony." The question was also discussed in the seven diocesan synods with differing results. Brechin and Aberdeen were opposed to the admission of the laity into synods, the latter favouring a mixed convention from which doctrinal subjects were to be excluded. The majorities in Moray and Argyll were favourable, as was also Glasgow, with a stipulation against the introduction of matters involving doctrine. St. Andrews was undecided, and Edinburgh recommended a General synod as the proper place for a settlement of the question. The bishops, influenced probably by the conflicting opinions of the clergy, were averse to holding a General synod; and the subject was again dropped.¹

While not denying to the presbyters the courage of their convictions, it is possible to read between the lines

¹ Grub, iv. 275-279; Ross's *Memoir of Bishop Ewing*, pp. 161, 202; *Scot. Eccles. Journal*, vols. ii.

and iii.; *Scot. Mag.*, new series, vols. ii. and iii.; Bp. Wordsworth's *Annals of my Life*, ii. 115-123.

the influence of the presiding bishop in the different diocesan synods. Bishop Forbes opposed the admission of the laity as strongly as bishop Ewing favoured it, while in the synod of St. Andrews, from which the bishop, Dr. Torry, was absent through infirmities of age, the presbyters were unable to come to any determination.

Upon the death of bishop Torry, 3rd October 1852, Mr. Wordsworth, warden of Trinity college, and the bishop of Moray were nominated for the see of St. Andrews. The former was elected by a majority of one, including his own vote. The validity of the election being disputed, the warden, to facilitate a settlement, agreed to withdraw his vote *pro ea vice*. On the second election Mr. Wordsworth and Dr. Suther of St. George's, Edinburgh, were nominated, and the former was again elected by a majority of one, which included his own vote as before. The minority protested against the election on the ground of irregularity, but their objections were overruled by the College of Bishops, there being then no canon of the Scottish Church against a presbyter's voting for himself.¹ Mr. Wordsworth was consecrated at Aberdeen on the Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul, 1853. The circumstances of his election made an inauspicious beginning to what proved a long and honoured episcopate. Not only the Episcopal Church, but Scotland, which he made his adopted country, would have been poorer without the pen and personality of bishop Wordsworth.²

The bishop of Argyll greatly favoured Mr. Words-

¹ In the *Annals of my Life*, bishop Wordsworth states that his opponents offered to elect him unanimously on condition of his resigning the wardenship. The unsuccessful nominees in the recent elections for Brechin and Moray had each voted for himself. According to canon law, Dr. Wordsworth on an equality of votes should

have been preferred as a member of the electing body to a nominee who was not.—*Annals of my Life*, ii. 132-136.

² *Scot. Mag.* ii. 585-606; *Scot. Eccles. Journal*, vols. ii. and iii.; Bp. Wordsworth's *Annals of my Life*, ii. 124-143.

worth's elevation to the episcopate, and influenced his colleagues to confirm the election. Bishop Ewing was a busy man in other ways during these years, penning religious sonnets, tracts, pamphlets, letters, pastorals, and charges; discussing "the larger hope" with Mr. Erskine of Linlathen, and Mr. Campbell, formerly of Row; disseminating their liberal views in *Present Day Papers*; preaching in Oxford and London, and influencing English bishops and laymen to support his diocesan work through the "Argyll Fund"; planning the quixotic scheme of a reformed Episcopal Church for Italy, with Turin as a basis and himself as the Reformer. During much of his episcopate he suffered from delicate health, and England and Italy latterly had as much of his presence as Argyll and the Isles.¹

Bishop's Skinner's death at Aberdeen on the 15th April 1857 closed an episcopate of forty years, during sixteen of which he had held the primacy. He was the third Skinner in succession who had rendered laudable service to the Church, and his brother, dean Skinner of Forfar, had been not less energetic in his day, especially in agitating for the admission of the laity into ecclesiastical synods. The pastoral lives of the three Skinners extended over more than a century, in which a father and son had occupied the see of Aberdeen for seventy-five years. They had witnessed many vicissitudes in the fortunes of the Episcopal Church, from the days of her deep depression, and almost extinction, under the iron heel of political persecution, down to the happier times of toleration when she was again permitted, without fear or favour of the State, to lengthen her cords and strengthen her stakes in her native land.

¹ See Ross's *Memoir* of the Bishop.

CHAPTER XXVIII

QUEEN VICTORIA: PERIOD 1857-1875

Eucharistic controversy—Trials of Mr. Cheyne and of bishop Forbes—Resignation of bishop Trower—General Synod of 1862-63—Its reforming canons—Clerical Disability Bill, 1864—Dr. Lee's liturgic reforms—Debate in General Assembly—Second debate in Assembly—Victory to Dr. Lee—Church Service Society and Scottish Church Society—Discussions on Union between the Presbyterian and Episcopal Churches, by dean Ramsay and Drs. Lee and Rorison—Union negotiations between the Free and United Presbyterian Churches—Union of the Reformed Presbyterian with Free Church—Proposals for Union of the Established and Free Churches—Laymen's league—Three Pan-Anglican conferences—Death of bishop Ewing—His characteristics—Foreign Mission schemes of Episcopal Church—Death of bishop Forbes—His literary work and influence.

ON the death of bishop Skinner Dr. Terrot, bishop of Edinburgh, became primus. For the vacant bishopric of Aberdeen, Dr. Suther and Patrick Cheyne, both incumbents in the city, were nominated. The former was elected by 13 to 9 votes, and consecrated at St. Paul's, Edinburgh, on the feast of St. John the Baptist, 1857.¹

In August 1857 bishop Forbes of Brechin delivered his primary charge to the clergy of his diocese, and published it immediately afterwards. The subject was the Holy Eucharist, which Dr. Forbes treated from a "Catholic" standpoint. As a consequence of the Oxford movement, there had been a gradual and marked develop-

¹ MS. Register Coll. Bishops, ii. 330.

ment of Eucharistic doctrine on lines which its advocates believed to be in accord with the teaching of high churchmen in Britain from the Reformation downwards, and also with the teaching of the primitive Fathers of the Church. Chief stress was laid in the charge on three points—the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, the lawfulness of the worship of Christ sacramentally present in the elements, and the Eucharist as a sacrifice as well as a communion. Similar views, it was alleged, had been held by a succession of Anglican divines; but they were none the less new and startling to old-fashioned churchmen of that day, and provoked much adverse criticism. The rev. P. Cheyne, incumbent of St. John's, Aberdeen, increased the growing irritation by publishing, in the spring of 1858, *Six Sermons on the Most Holy Eucharist*, in which the same subject was treated in a more uncompromising manner, and in language which even bishop Forbes characterised as "provocative." The result of these two publications—charge and sermons—was "the Eucharistic Controversy."

Mr. Cheyne, on the 23rd April 1858, was presented for unsound teaching to the bishop of Aberdeen by the rev. Gilbert Rorison, Peterhead, and two laymen of the diocese. The trial took place in the diocesan synod on the 15th June. The respondent (Mr. Cheyne) took exception through his legal adviser, Mr. Grub, to certain points in the form of presentment. When the bishop decided against the sufficiency of the objections, the respondent protested and declined to plead on the merits of the case until his protest had been disposed of. The trial proceeded notwithstanding, and the bishop gave his judgment on the 5th August, suspending the respondent "from his office of a presbyter of the Episcopal Church in Scotland."¹ An

¹ *Scot. Eccles. Journal*, 1858, p. 129.

appeal was made on Mr. Cheyne's behalf to the Episcopal synod which met at Edinburgh on the 4th November. The opinions of the bishops were, with one exception, adverse to the appellant, but they delayed judgment until the 2nd December that he might reconsider and retract such portions of his teaching as they had marked for censure. When the synod reassembled, Mr. Cheyne declined to make any retraction, whereupon his appeal was dismissed and the judgment of the bishop of Aberdeen affirmed. The bishop of Brechin entered his protest against the decision.¹

Notwithstanding his suspension Mr. Cheyne continued to officiate as deacon, on the double plea that he had been suspended only *as* presbyter, and that he was still incumbent of St. John's church. He was again cited by his Diocesan before the synod of Aberdeen, 3rd May 1859, on the charge of disobedience to the sentence of the courts. Mr. Cheyne objected to the relevancy of the charge, and the bishop, overruling the objection, proceeded to hear proof of the breach of suspension. The respondent was found guilty, and on the 27th May declared to be no longer a clergyman of the Episcopal Church in Scotland. Mr. Cheyne protested, and appealed to the Episcopal synod, which, on the 9th November following, affirmed the sentence of the lower court.²

With a view to allay the excitement prevalent in the Church a motion had been made in the Episcopal synod,

¹ This protest was afterwards deleted from the minutes by order of the synod, the bishop of Moray characterising protests as an entire novelty in the Episcopal synod, in which the primus and the other bishops concurred.—MS. Reg. of the Coll. of Bishops, ii. 384, 406, 408.

² For the Cheyne case see MS. Reg. of the Coll. of Bishops, ii. 343-

355 and 360-394, 410-412, 431; *Scot. Eccles. Journal*, 1858-9, and Ross's *Memoir of Bishop Ewing*, pp. 278, 287, 289. Mr. Cheyne afterwards made explanations to the bishops, upon which, in October 1863, he was restored to his full ecclesiastical status.—MS. Reg. of the Coll. of Bishops, iii. 313.

11th December 1857, to issue a synodical declaration on the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. From want of agreement among the bishops in synod this proposal was abandoned.¹ The primus, and bishops Ewing and Trower, then published a "Declaration" on their own responsibility, which was immediately followed by a "Statement" from bishops Eden and Wordsworth making known their reasons for not having signed the Declaration of the primus.² It was not then known that judicial proceedings would be taken against bishop Forbes, otherwise the extrajudicial action of his colleagues would have been altogether indefensible. At a special meeting of the Episcopal synod, 27th May 1858, it was resolved to issue a Pastoral Letter to the Church on the subject of bishop Forbes's primary charge, the bishop of Brechin protesting against the competency of the synod's action. The Pastoral was published, and ordered to be formally communicated by each of the bishops to their clergy in the diocesan synods.³

The Episcopal Church was now embroiled in a bitter controversy by letters, sermons, pamphlets, and pastorals, which seriously disturbed her peace, and for a time arrested her progress. Keble was brought into the field by the Declaration of the three bishops, which he understood as intended to censure his work recently published on "Eucharistical Adoration." In defence he wrote "Considerations suggested by a late Pastoral Letter on the Doctrine of the Most Holy Eucharist," which he addressed to the Scottish presbyters.

Bishop Trower had made himself prominent in opposition to the Eucharistic teaching of the bishop of Brechin,

¹ MS. Reg. of the Coll. of Bishops, ii. 336.

² *Scot. Eccles. Journal*, 1858, p. 18.

³ MS. Reg. of the Coll. of Bishops, ii. 337-339, 340.

and laboured zealously but not always wisely to bring his clergy to see eye to eye with him on the Eucharist. Wearied at last with controversy, and feeling increasingly the inconvenience of non-residence, he resigned his episcopal office on 3rd February 1859.¹ The bishop of Moray, and Mr. Wilson, incumbent at Ayr and dean of the diocese, were nominated for the see of Glasgow and Galloway on the 15th March. The latter was elected by 10 to 8 votes, and consecrated in St. Paul's, Edinburgh, on Easter Tuesday 1859, bishop Trower being the preacher.²

Before the final stages were reached in Mr. Cheyne's case a presentment had been lodged with the Episcopal synod against the bishop of Brechin by the rev. William Henderson, incumbent of St. Mary's, Arbroath, and two laymen of his congregation, after a lapse of two years from the delivery of the charge.

The first steps in the judicial proceedings against bishop Forbes were the presentment by Mr. Henderson on 3rd October 1859, and its acceptance by the Episcopal synod on the 10th of the same month. The case was partly heard on the 7th and 8th February 1860, and resumed on the 14th March. Next day the finding of the Court was delivered, to the effect that "in certain respects the teaching of the respondent is unsanctioned by the Articles and Formularies of the Church, and is to a certain extent inconsistent therewith; but that in consideration of the explanations and modifications offered by the respondent in his answers, and also that he now only asks toleration for his opinions but does not claim for them the authority of the Church, or any right to enforce them on those subject to his jurisdiction," the

¹ MS. Reg. of the Coll. of Bishops,
ii. 395-397.

² *Ibid.* pp. 399, 400.

Court limited its sentence to a declaration of censure and admonition.¹

In March 1862, bishop Terrot, through increasing infirmities, resigned the primacy, and the office was conferred in July on bishop Eden of Moray.² On the application of Dr. Terrot for a coadjutor, dean Ramsay was elected as against Mr. Orde of St. Paul's, Edinburgh. The dean declined the office as he had already declined a similar offer from Glasgow. Before the next election the General synod had passed a canon conferring upon lay representatives a vote in the election of a bishop. The election of the rev. T. B. Morrell, rector of Henley-on-Thames, 28th November 1862, as coadjutor bishop of Edinburgh was the first occasion on which the laity exercised this privilege.³ The bishop-elect was consecrated in 1863, and, on his resigning the office some years afterwards, Dr. Cotterill, bishop of Grahamstown,

¹ MS. Reg. of the Coll. of Bishops, ii. 416, 436-451; Numerous contemporary pamphlets, *Scot. Eccles. Journal*, 1859, 1860; Ross's *Memoir of Bishop Ewing*, pp. 273-277, 287, 289, 297, 298; Coleridge's *Life of Keble*, pp. 435-437, 442-445; Liddon's *Life of Dr. Pusey*, iii. 448-459. At p. 458, vol. iii., of *Pusey's Life* there is the following just criticism on the finding of the Scottish bishops—"Pusey pointed out that there were misleading suggestions in the document in regard to the bishop's conduct. The judgment, for instance, spoke of modifications offered by the bishop in reference to the first charge; the plural was unwarranted, for the only withdrawal which the bishop made under that head was to substitute a very emphatic passage of St. Cyril of Alexandria, provided the judges would accept it instead of language of his own. Again, the judgment says that the bishop does not 'now' claim more than toleration.

He never claimed more. The 'now' is therefore superfluous, and suggests an incorrect idea. The judgment says that the bishop 'does not claim for them (his opinions) the authority of the Church, or any right to enforce them on those subject to his jurisdiction.' While the latter clause is true, nothing would have been further from the bishop's mind than to allow that he had taught simply his own 'opinions,' and that he could not claim for them the authority of the Church 'in the sense of her expressed mind, and as a practical guide to the faith of her children.'" Keble was present at the trial of bishop Forbes in Edinburgh. It was reported at the time and has since been confirmed—see *Pusey's Life* at pages cited—that he largely assisted the bishop in his "Theological Defence."

² MS. Reg. of the Coll. of Bishops, iii. 44.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 66, 88; *Scot. Eccles. Journal* for 1862, p. 221.

was unanimously elected by both chambers in April 1871. On the death of bishop Terrot in April 1873, Dr. Cotterill succeeded him in the bishopric of Edinburgh.¹

The Episcopal synod had, in 1859, appointed a mixed committee of clergy and laity to report upon the existing code of canons. The draft submitted by them ultimately led to the holding of a General Synod, which sat from the 8th to the 16th July 1862, and continued by successive adjournments until the 13th February 1863.² The chief changes introduced were a lay representative from each congregation admitted to vote in the election of a bishop; laymen permitted by the bishop to address diocesan synods; lay readers and catechists sanctioned; assistant curates and mission clergy of three years' standing in the diocese made members of synod, and entitled to vote in the election of a bishop; the position of curates or assistants recognised and regulated; the offices of diocesan chancellor, registrar, and auditor constituted under canon; restriction of clerical vestments to those now in use; certain amendments in the canons of discipline suggested by the recent trials; and, most important of all, the removal of the Scottish Office from its position of "primary authority as the authorised service of the Episcopal Church," and "the adoption of the English Book of Common Prayer as the Service Book of the Church."³

The new features in these canons point to a broadening of the Church's constitution, to progress in various directions, and to the presence of disturbing elements of

¹ MS. Reg. of the Coll. of Bishops, iii. 408; iv. 1.

² *Ibid.* iii. 94-292.

³ After the General synod the rev. G. H. Forbes of Burntisland raised an action in the Court of Session disputing the power of the Synod to alter the status of the Scottish Office. An interlocutor was pronounced by

the Court, 18th March 1865, finding that "pursuer's averments were not relevant or sufficient in law to support the conclusion of the action." Mr. Forbes appealed to the House of Lords, where he argued his own case, April 1867, with remarkable ability but without success.—*Scot. Guardian*, 1865, p. 198, and 1867, p. 232.

controversy. The laity were admitted into diocesan synods, and their ancient right to a voice in the election of a bishop was restored under canonical safeguards. The growth of the Church is indicated by the appearance in the canons of the mission priest, the curate, and the lay reader. The canon in restraint of vestments pointed to the contemporary ritualistic movement in England which it was intended to arrest at the English Border. The altered position of the Scottish Office ended the long struggle between north and south, in which the latter now triumphed as the former was wont to do by the sufficient majority. Bishop Ewing, an Aberdonian by birth, had been unrelenting in his opposition to the "national" Office, seeking its entire suppression from a fond desire for closer connection with the Church of England,¹ while bishop Wordsworth, a worthy Anglican, was as warm an advocate of its retention. The restrictions now placed by canon on the use of the Scottish Office do not appear to present the conditions either of an equitable compromise or of a final settlement, and probably the last word has not been spoken on the subject.

Reference has been made to the unsatisfactory clerical Disability Bill of 1840, and to the slight relief it afforded to the Episcopal clergy from the disabling clauses of the Act of 1792. In 1864 the duke of Buccleuch was instrumental in carrying through Parliament a more effective Bill, which removed the last of the civil disabilities affecting the Episcopal clergy in Scottish orders.² Bishop Ewing had been an active agent in the cause for twenty years, and since 1861 had held frequent interviews and correspondence with the Anglican bishops favourable to the measure, and especially with his friend Dr. Tait,

¹ Ross's *Memoir of Bishop Ewing*, pp. 280, 288, 297.

² Act 27 and 28 Vic. cap. 94.

then bishop of London.¹ By the Clerical Disabilities Bill of 1864, clergy in Scottish orders were placed on an equality with English clergymen and made eligible for any ecclesiastical office or benefice in the Church of England, with the consent of the bishop of the diocese.²

The Act, while removing an unjust and invidious restriction, testified to the practical union between the Episcopal Churches, established and disestablished, on the two sides of the Border. It was probably this aspect of the case that provoked the opposition of certain leading ministers of the Scottish Establishment. Dr. Robert Lee was then in the thick of the contest raised by his laudable effort to improve the public worship of the Established Church. He regarded the Episcopalian Disabilities Bill, not as the removal of Erastian fetters from a section of his countrymen, but as the conferring of a peculiar privilege by Act of Parliament upon a rival Church. In this view he actively opposed the measure. Jealous of the influence which Episcopacy had among the educated classes he dreaded that the representatives of the same class within the Establishment, whom he was anxious to retain, might be induced to go over to Episcopacy for the "more excellent way" of worship.³ He introduced the subject of the Disabilities Bill into the General Assembly of 1864, and at his suggestion a committee was appointed to examine and report upon the measure. Happily the Assembly was better advised than to burn its fingers by intermeddling in the matter. The report of its committee was to the effect that "there was nothing in the bill

¹ Ross's *Memoir of Bishop Ewing*, pp. 312, 322, 330, 362-364, 403.

² MS. Reg. of the Coll. of Bishops, iii. 319-333.

³ Dr. Lee candidly admits as much

in his *Reform of the Church of Scotland*, chap. vi., on "Secessions to the Episcopal Church and its Causes."

requiring any expression of opinion on the part of the General Assembly." ¹

Dr. Robert Lee was professor of Biblical Criticism in the University of Edinburgh, and minister of Old Greyfriars'. In 1845 his church was destroyed by fire, and on its restoration, twelve years afterwards, he deemed the occasion opportune for introducing a better type of congregational worship. Nothing could have been less edifying than the ordinary Presbyterian service as described by eminent Presbyterians themselves. Principals Tulloch and Cunningham have already been cited for the services common in the last century. Dr. Scott of St. George's, Edinburgh, is equally candid on the style of public worship prevalent in the parish churches of Scotland down to the middle of the present century, and which still survives in remote districts. "One looks back," he says, "with amazement to the system which generally prevailed scarcely thirty years ago." ² Worship there could hardly be in a system which lacked its prominent elements. Liturgical it certainly was, but after the worst of types. In some churches the opening and closing prayers never varied from year to year; psalms and tunes came round with the same unvarying regularity; the Lord's Prayer was seldom heard. In many others there was no reading of Scripture. So thoroughly had the injunction of 1812 fallen into disuse that, in 1856, the Assembly had to ordain the reading of a portion of the Old and New Testament in every diet of worship." ³

Such was the state of things when Dr. Lee began his reform of Presbyterian worship. With this object he

¹ *Scot. Guardian*, June and July 1864; Irving's *Annals*, 21st August 1864, when the Bill passed the House of Commons; Story's *Life of Dr. Lee*, ii. 116-120.

² *St. Giles' Lectures*, first series, p. 350, published in 1881.

³ See also Story's *Life of Dr. Lee*, vol. i. chap. xi.

introduced a Service Book, based on the Westminster Directory, the use of an organ, kneeling at prayer and standing at praise, together with private prayer of the worshipper before and after service. At once he was attacked in the public press for unwarranted innovations and playing at Episcopacy. The presbytery of Edinburgh called him to account in February 1859, and in the Assembly of that year he had to defend his right to the use of a liturgy. There had been no such excitement within the Assembly since the memorable debates on patronage and the Veto in the pre-disruption days. Dr. Lee spoke for two hours, and made an able defence of his position, cleverly retorting upon his opponents by showing that they were greater offenders against the laws of the Church both by omission and commission than he was by his alleged innovations. The professor was a master in dialectics, and his ability was never seen to greater advantage than in the fence and thrust of a public debate. The result was a majority of 140 to 110 votes in favour of toleration of his reforms, with the exception of reading the prayers from a printed book which was forbidden. Among his supporters were prominent ministers such as principal Tulloch, Dr. Norman M'Leod, and Dr. Bisset, all of them moderators in their day, and men of wide influence. The most notable of his opponents was his colleague in the University, professor Robertson of Endowment fame.¹

Dr. Lee abandoned the use of a printed book of prayers after the decision of 1859, but in 1863 he resumed it. Next year he stood for the second time on his defence before the Assembly. There was another lengthy liturgical debate in which Dr. Hill charged Dr.

¹ Story's *Life of Dr. Lee*, i. 327-365; Charteris's *Life of Dr. Robertson*, pp. 351-354.

Lee with violating the injunction of the Assembly. The accusation admitted of no denial, but the accused parried it adroitly with a home thrust at Dr. Hill. "I think my reverend friend remembers a word of three syllables—Strathbogie. Did not he disobey the command of the General Assembly there? And was not that command as solemnly given and as seriously considered as any which the General Assembly of 1859 ever addressed to me?"¹ Proceeding, Dr. Lee said—"I would far rather that you forbade me to read my sermons than my prayers. It is far more natural to read a prayer than to read a sermon. You look men in the face when you speak to them, but it is of no consequence where you are looking when you are speaking to the King Eternal, Immortal, and Invisible." The Assembly decided, by the substantial majority of 151 to 64 votes, not to curtail the liberty which the doctor had so eloquently claimed for himself and his congregation. In his diary Dr. Lee gratefully chronicles the decision as a "Revolution."² Such, indeed, it was, not only for the Established, but also, as it has proved, for all the Presbyterian Churches.

One evident result of Dr. Lee's labours was the formation, in the spring of 1865, of the Church Service Society, which now numbers, besides laymen, more than a third, and these the most scholarly, of the parish ministers in the Established Church. The Society has published several editions of the Euchologion, or Book of Common Order—a veritable Presbyterian liturgy. The Scottish Church Society, formed in more recent years, also owes its origin, indirectly at least, to the movement inaugurated by Dr. Lee.³

¹ Dr. Hill and many other Moderates had gone to Strathbogie, and assisted the deposed ministers in defiance of the Assembly's Act of 1841.

² *Story's Life of Dr. Lee*, ii. 58-66.

³ The late professor Milligan, a learned theologian and most estimable man, was president of this Society at his death in 1894.

He was not, however, left in the undisturbed possession of his Prayer Book. In presbytery, synod, and Assembly, his opponents were unwearied in their efforts to have it ejected from the Old Greyfriars'. In 1867 the case was again to have engaged the Assembly. On the day before it opened, Dr. Lee, riding into Edinburgh from the country, fell from his horse—struck down with paralysis. The strife of tongues was instantly hushed. In the midst of the turmoil, and not improbably from its effects, the leader of reform had fallen; but not before he had left his mark on the Presbyterian worship of Scotland and made, as a pioneer, a pathway for others likeminded to follow.¹

Dr. Lee was also prominent in efforts to repeal the Patronage Act of lord Aberdeen, which had failed to allay parochial strife, and to relax the stringency of subscription to the Westminster Confession. Both measures were carried after his death—the former in 1874, the latter in 1889. On the question of subscription he had the assistance of several leading men, both laymen and ministers; and, among others, of principal Tulloch, a genial broad churchman with truly catholic sympathies. Both divines were abused in their day as latitudinarians, and Dr. Lee's teaching was as freely accused of rationalism as his service in Greyfriars' was of being a mongrel Episcopacy.²

A third scheme—the union of Established Presbytery with disestablished Episcopacy—in which Dr. Lee was engaged, did not meet with equal success. Dean Ramsay and the rev. Dr. Rorison, Peterhead, were correspondents on the side of Episcopacy. The dean, writing to Dr. Lee

¹ Dr. Lee lived for nearly a year afterwards, but was unable to resume his public duties. He died at Torquay, 12th March 1868, in his sixty-

fourth year.

² See Story's *Life of Dr. Lee*, vol. ii. chap. vii.

in 1864, said—"I do not hold that Episcopacy is essential to the 'esse' of a Church; I think it an element for the 'bene esse' of a Church; perhaps I might add for the 'optime esse.'" Dr. Rorison addressed several letters to the *Scotsman* in the autumn of 1864 on the subject of union. "The Established Church," he wrote, "is strong—strong in her legal status, in her rights of spiritual self-government, in her full representation of the laity in her Church Courts, in her invaluable parochial system, in her million or more of the Scottish people. But she is weak in her want of liturgical worship, of ancient traditions, of Church orders, of effective and permanent presidency in her synods, weak in the estrangement of the upper classes, and weak above all, in necessary separation from the Church of England. Now, the Episcopal Church (from perfectly intelligible historical causes) is numerically weak. Her congregations, compared to those of the Establishment, are but as one to seven; her worshippers but as one to twenty. She may be weak in other respects which her adversaries are keen-eyed to descry. But in some things she is strong. She is strong in her spiritual independence, and is not likely to part with it. She is strong in her newly-acquired trust of the laity, and gradual concession to them of their due share in Church government. She is strong in her respect for ancient order, in her constitutional episcopate, and in her noble liturgy. She is strong in the affection of the upper ranks, and the hereditary allegiance of the Scottish aristocracy. Lastly, she is now strong, far stronger than ever, by the blessing of Providence, on the duke of Buccleuch's effort to recover the confiscated rights of her clergy, and thus to perfect her ecclesiastical relations with the sister Church of England. These strengths, separated, are, speaking in the large interests of national religion, in a great measure reduced to weakness.

These weaknesses by union would be transfigured into strength."

Dr. Rorison opened correspondence in September with Dr. Lee, who wrote in reply—"I hope, and I have no doubt, that the reforms which I desire to see adopted in the Scottish Established Church, will, if adopted, remove many obstructions to a union with the Church of England, and will diminish all. The great difficulty, however, that of *orders*, is one which Episcopacy has created, and it is one which the Episcopal Church must remove." Dr. Lee wished to know how many sympathisers Dr. Rorison had in the Episcopal Church, and the latter assured him that he expressed the opinions of a great majority. It was arranged that representatives from both sides should meet to discuss the basis of union, in lord Rollo's house at Duncrub Park, in the autumn of 1864. The conference was postponed, and the idea of it latterly abandoned, popular feeling at the time inclining too strongly in an adverse direction.¹

The same quarter of this century witnessed other fruitless attempts at ecclesiastical reunion. In 1863 a strong desire was expressed by the Free Church for union with the New Light Presbyterians, better known now as the United Presbyterian Church. The latter had gradually drifted into the position of Voluntaries, strongly opposed to any connection between Church and State. The Free Church, in the course of twenty years' separation from the State Church, had ceased to cherish the hope of return to the "vitiated Establishment," and naturally looked for alliance in a different quarter. A committee

¹ Story's *Life of Dr. Lee*, ii. 122-135; Dr. Story, p. 132, attributes the failure of the negotiations "in some measure" to the "keeping entirely aloof from the National Church" of

the bishop of London, Dr. Tait, while taking the Episcopal duties of bishop Ewing in Argyll. See also Ross's *Memoir of Bishop Ewing*, chap. xxiv.

was formed, and negotiations opened with the United Presbyterians in 1863, and for ten years they were continued. The union would probably have been effected but for the determined opposition of the constitutional minority in the Free Church, who protested against it as inconsistent with the principle of a national recognition of religion. They threatened appeal to the civil courts, with a claim to the property of the Free Church, in the event of the majority forcing a union with the Voluntaries. The result was that the idea of incorporating union was abandoned, and a scheme substituted of Mutual Eligibility of ministers between the negotiating Churches. Dr. Candlish, in moving the resolution to this effect, which with some modification was adopted by the Assembly of 1873, expressed his keen disappointment at the small result obtained after so much labour and battle. "We take the attitude," he said, "of beaten men. They have compelled us to desist from prosecuting the movement toward incorporating union. . . . I am no prophet, but I do venture to predict that you will not all be in your graves before that day comes, and that there will be a goodly remnant of you when that day comes."¹ Twenty-two years have since passed ; Dr. Candlish and Dr. Begg, with many other prominent leaders for and against union, have been gathered to their fathers, and still the day of union seems remote.

The Free Church was more successful in effecting a union with the small remnant of Cameronians or Covenanters, known as "the Reformed Presbyterian Church," which first assumed its attitude of protest after the Revolution. They ultimately disowned the Presbyterian Establishment of king William, because it was not the

¹ *Chapters from History of Free Church*, by Dr. Norman Walker, pp. 232-251.

legitimate descendant of the Covenantee Church, and had been imposed upon Scotland by a "graceless government," which had rejected the Solemn League and Covenant. For a similar reason they forbade their members to take the oath of allegiance, or to exercise the franchise. To do either was an excommunicable offence. With the growing light of the nineteenth century more liberal views prevailed, and the Presbyterian Church, which has seen many disruptions and few unions, saw the union of "the oldest and the youngest of its non-established branches" on the 25th May 1876, when all but two or three of the scattered Cameronian congregations were received into the communion of the Free Church.¹

One more effort in the line of Presbyterian reunion falls here to be recorded. The Assembly of the Established Church, through its committee on Union, invited, in 1878, the Assembly of the Free Church to consider the question of reunion on the basis of "the national recognition of the Christian religion as contained in the Confession of Faith, and the sacredness of the ancient religious endowments, the steadfast adherence to the doctrine of the Confession of Faith, and the Presbyterian system of church government and worship." The Free Church committee acknowledged "the courteous and considerate manner" in which the Established Church, "after such a long estrangement," had approached them. While agreeing in lamenting the divided state of Presbyterianism in Scotland, and in the desire for reunion, they answered that "they feel it to be their duty frankly to call the attention of their brethren in the Established Church to the Claim of Right adopted in 1842, and to the Protest laid upon the table of the General Assembly in 1843." They suggest that only on the basis of that Claim and Protest was there

¹ *Chapters from History of Free Church*, by Dr. N. Walker, pp. 251-255.

any reasonable hope of reuniting the divided sections of Presbyterianism. This was delicate ground to invite the Established Church to traverse. No answer was returned by them until 1886, when a Bill for their disestablishment having been introduced into Parliament they again approached the Free Assembly with the same proposals. The latter had, three days before, recorded a resolution, by the decisive majority of 450 to 99, in favour of disestablishment and disendowment. In next year's Established Assembly the question was reopened, and a fresh overture sent to the Free Church, which replied to the effect that the only road to reunion lay through disestablishment. This view was affirmed in the Free Assembly of 1887 by a vote of 322 to 66, and so ended the negotiations between the two Assemblies.

A "Laymen's League" has since been formed, comprising members of the three principal Presbyterian Churches, with the object of effecting reunion on the basis of establishment. Unofficial conferences are also being held between representative ministers and laymen of the three Churches, with the same end in view, and with disestablishment left as an open question. Theoretically it may be left open, but practically it has been closed, and that very firmly, by repeated decisions of both the United Presbyterian and Free Churches.¹

In September 1867 the first conference of bishops, commonly known as the Pan-Anglican Synod, was convened at Lambeth palace by Dr. Longley, archbishop of Canterbury. It was attended by 78 bishops from the Anglican communion at home and abroad. The growth of the Episcopal Church in the United States and in the British colonies made the necessity felt of some central assembly

¹ *Chapters from History of Free Church*, by Dr. Norman Walker, pp. 255-264.

for deliberation and counsel. The archbishop of Canterbury, in the absence of a patriarch over the churches of the English-speaking race, was urged by his episcopal brethren to invite the bishops from all parts for brotherly conference in England. The trial of Dr. Colenso, bishop of Natal, and his deposition in 1864 for unsound teaching, by the metropolitan and bishops of South Africa, had increased the desire for mutual consultation between the several branches of the Anglo-Catholic Church. The sentence of the South African province was recognised, but not confirmed by the Lambeth Conference, and no invitation had been sent to the deposed bishop. The following subjects were dealt with in Conference:—The best way of promoting the reunion of Christendom; the notification of the establishment of new sees; letters commendatory for clergymen and laymen passing to distant dioceses; subordination in our Colonial Church to metropolitans; court of the metropolitan; questions of appeal; conditions of union with the church at home; notification of proposed missionary bishoprics; subordination of missionaries. A second Conference was held at Lambeth under the presidency of archbishop Tait of Canterbury, in July 1878, attended by 95 bishops. Among the subjects discussed were—The best mode of maintaining union among the various churches of the Anglican communion; voluntary boards of arbitration for churches to which such an arrangement may be applicable; the relations to each other of missionary bishops and missionaries, of various branches of the Anglican communion in the same country; the position of Anglican chaplains and chaplaincies on the continent of Europe and elsewhere; modern forms of infidelity, and the best means of dealing with them; the condition, progress, and needs of the various churches of the Anglican communion. In July 1888 archbishop Benson convened

the third Pan-Anglican conference, when 130 bishops were present. The reports of its committees were on the following subjects—Intemperance, purity, divorce, polygamy, observance of Sunday, socialism, care of emigrants, mutual relations of dioceses and branches of the Anglican communion, home reunion, Scandinavian Church, Old Catholics, etc., Eastern Churches, authoritative standards of doctrine and worship. On the mutual relation of Churches it was resolved that no particular portion of the Church should undertake revision of the Book of Common Prayer without seriously considering the possible effect of such action on other branches of the Church. On the important question of home reunion the following conditions were suggested as a basis: (a) The holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as “containing all things necessary to salvation,” and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; (b) The Apostles’ creed as the baptismal symbol, and the Nicene creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith; (c) The two sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unflinching use of Christ’s words of institution, and of the elements ordained by Him; (d) The historic Episcopate locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church. The conference expressed its readiness to enter into correspondence with representatives of other Christian communions of the English-speaking races on the steps to be taken towards corporate reunion, or towards such relations as might prepare the way for fuller organic unity hereafter.¹

¹ The Scottish bishops were present at all the three Conferences. See authorised reports of Lambeth conferences, *Scottish Guardian* for the several years; Ross’s *Memoir of Bishop Ewing*, pp. 467-484, and

Irving’s *Annals* for 1867 and 1878, pp. 790 and 1289; “Encyclical Letter from the Bishops with the Resolutions and Reports,”—S.P.C.K., 1888.

Bishop Ewing, who had taken part in the first Lambeth conference and surprised his brethren by the singularity of his sympathy with Dr. Colenso, did not survive to see the second conference under his friend archbishop Tait. He died at his brother's residence in England on Ascension Day 1873, in his sixtieth year. For one with health so precarious his life had been remarkably active. Altogether he was a notable man, with a unique personality, and a peculiarly versatile mind. His sympathies were chiefly with the broad school of theology, and he was the personal friend of many of its leaders, such as Erskine of Linlathen and M'Leod Campbell in Scotland, Maurice, Stanley, Jowett, and others in England. No Scottish bishop was better known south of the Border than the venerable and ascetic-looking bishop of Argyll. Bishop Wordsworth described him and Dr. Forbes of Brechin as the two most distinguished bishops of Scotland in this century. Most Scottish churchmen would rank Dr. Wordsworth himself as second to none. Bishop Ewing gave occasional trouble to his Episcopal colleagues, by the profession of liberal opinions which, but for them, he would have translated into practice, in the matter of intercommunion with the Scottish Establishment. His mantle as a prophet of union fell on the worthy shoulders of bishop Wordsworth.¹

At a meeting held at Lochgilphead, 31st July 1873, for the election of a successor to bishop Ewing, the rev. and hon. A. G. Douglas, vicar of Shapwick, Dorsetshire, and provost Cazenove of Cumbræ were nominated. The provost had a small majority in each chamber, but as three laymen claimed an adverse vote against both nominees, neither had an absolute majority of lay votes, and dean M'George ruled that there had been no election. A

¹ MS. Reg. of the Coll. of Bishops, iii. 423-448; Ross's *Memoir of Bishop Ewing*, pp. 618-643.

subsequent meeting was held, 8th October, when provost Cazenove was the only nominee. He received a majority of clerical but not of lay votes, and the dean again ruled as formerly. At a third meeting, on 14th January 1874, the rev. G. R. Mackarness, vicar of Ilam, Staffordshire, and the rev. and hon. A. G. Douglas were nominated. The vote was twice taken without result, and on the substitution of the name of the rev. D. F. Sandford of St. John's, Edinburgh, for that of Mr. Douglas, Mr. Mackarness was elected. He was consecrated in St. Mary's, Glasgow, on Lady Day 1874, his brother, the bishop of Oxford, taking part in the consecration, and the dean of York preaching the sermon.¹

The Scottish Episcopal Church had hitherto supported foreign missions by contributions to the great societies of the Church of England. The earnest appeal made by Dr. Livingstone to the people of England, and more especially to its Universities, on behalf of missions to "the Dark Continent," awakened the whole Church to a livelier sense of her obligations to the heathen races. Charles Mackenzie, a member of an old Scottish family long devoted to the Episcopal Church, and a personal friend of Livingstone, whose acquaintance he had made in Africa, was the first to respond to his call, and went with a small staff of clergy as missionary bishop to central Africa.² His early and lamented death by the Zambesi—his episcopate only lasted through the year 1861—stirred up fresh volunteers to follow where he had fallen. The bishops of South Africa, on learning that the Scottish Church was planning a mission to the heathen, memorialised its bishops, 4th December 1871, suggesting Kaffraria as a promising field.

¹ MS. Reg. of the Coll. of Bishops, iv. 33-40, 44.; *Scottish Guardian* for 1873-74.

² Bishop Mackenzie wrote to the

Scottish primus on the subject of an independent Scottish mission in West Africa.—MS. Reg. of the Coll. of Bishops, iii. 21.

The suggestion was adopted, and Dr. Callaway, who had already spent many years as medical missionary in that district, was appointed to the bishopric of Kaffraria, and consecrated in St. Paul's, Edinburgh, on All Saints' day 1873.¹ At the recommendation of primus Eden, in April 1871, the district of Chanda in the diocese of Calcutta was also taken up by the Church. For the last twenty years both missions have been supported, that of Kaffraria very largely, by the Church's board of foreign missions. A connection was also formed indirectly with other mission-fields through the consecration at Edinburgh, in 1871, of bishop Webb for Bloemfontein, and of bishop Kestell-Cornish in Inverness in 1874 for Madagascar.²

Bishop Forbes of Brechin died on the 8th October 1875, in his fifty-eighth year, at Dundee, where he had spent the twenty-eight years of his episcopate. Dundee was the most populous town in his diocese, and he purposely selected it for his residence with a view to mission work among the poor. As incumbent of St. Paul's the bishop was a hard-working parish priest to the end of his days—a model to his clergy, and a noble example to all, of consecrated devotion to duty. Clergy and congregations multiplied in Dundee, and the good bishop was the main-spring and stay of them all. As a citizen, he took an active interest in all that concerned the welfare of the people, and was much beloved by them in return. Of a warmly sympathetic nature, he was a persuasive preacher; and was, moreover, an accomplished scholar, a lover of the arts and especially of architecture, and conversant with several modern languages. In the midst of multifarious duties as bishop, and still more as pastor of a large con-

¹ MS. Reg. of the Coll. of Bishops, iv. 17-25 and 30, 31; *Scottish Guardian*, Dec. 1871, p. 277 and Nov. 1873, p. 382.

² MS. Reg. of the Coll. of Bishops, of bishop Kestell-Cornish's consecration, iv. 44.

gregation, he was always busy with his pen, and from time to time gave the Church the fruits of his erudition.¹ His death evoked the liveliest expressions of regret from members of the Episcopal Church at home and abroad, and also from many in other communions who revered his devoted life. In the chancel of his own stately church of St. Paul, a memorial alike of his zeal and of his cultured taste, his body was buried amid the sorrow of a whole city.²

¹ In theology, he wrote a treatise on the Nicene creed, and a more elaborate work on the Thirty-nine Articles; in history, a Kalendar of the Scottish saints, and editions of the lives of SS. Ninian and Kentigern, and of Adamnan's St. Columba, being the fifth and sixth vols. of the *Historians of Scotland*. He was also the author of four volumes of sermons, several important charges, and numerous devotional commentaries.

² An exceptional minute is made in the MS. Reg. of the Coll. of

Bishops on the death of bishop Forbes to the following effect—"The bishops cannot enter upon the business of the Episcopal synod to-day without recording an affectionate expression of their sense of the severe loss which they and the Church in Scotland have experienced in the death of their late beloved brother, the bishop of Brechin." It is understood that papers bearing upon his life and episcopate are preserved under seal, not to be opened within twenty-five years from his death.

CHAPTER XXIX

QUEEN VICTORIA: PERIOD 1875-1895

Bishop Jermyn of Brechin—The Lay Question—General Synod 1876—Formation of Representative Church Council—Cathedrals of Inverness, Cumbrae, and Edinburgh—Discord in Glasgow Roman mission—Erection of Roman hierarchy in Scotland, 1878—Indifference of Presbyterians and the Press to Roman advance—Protest by Scottish bishops—Theological change in Presbyterian churches—Trials for “heresies” :—in the U.P. Church, the Ferguson and Macrae cases ; in Established Church, *Scotch Sermons*, Macfarlane case ; and in Free Church, professors Robertson Smith, Dodds, Bruce, and Drummond—Bishop Seabury centenary in Aberdeen, 1884—Canon Liddon’s election for see of Edinburgh—His reason for refusal—General Synod, 1890—Bishop Wordsworth’s death—His advocacy of Ecclesiastical Union—Recent progress of Scottish Episcopacy—Changes in public worship, both Presbyterian and Episcopal, in theological thought, in religious habits of the people—Growth of scepticism and materialism, an additional incentive to Ecclesiastical Union.

FOR the vacant see of Brechin several names were mentioned, and among others that of canon Liddon, who, in a private letter to the dean, declined to be nominated.¹ Shortly afterwards (14th December 1875) Dr. Jermyn, formerly bishop of Colombo, was unanimously elected by the clergy and laity of the diocese as bishop Forbes’s successor. The confidence expressed in bishop Jermyn by his election to the see has been since extended by his Episcopal colleagues in their choice of him as *primus*.²

¹ For canon Liddon’s opinion on Englishmen for Scottish bishoprics see his letter cited *infra* upon his election

in 1886 to the see of Edinburgh.

² Dr. Jermyn was at one time incumbent of Forbes.

What is known as the Lay Question had been simmering for some years, until it was actively revived in the diocesan synods of 1870. While most of the clergy were prepared to admit the laity to a larger share in the management of the Church's affairs through mixed conventions of laity and clergy, the feeling was strongly expressed by others that laymen should not be members of the diocesan and general synods where doctrinal subjects fall to be discussed. At the annual Episcopal Synod of November 1870, where the matter was brought up, three of the bishops—Breachin, Aberdeen, and Glasgow—were opposed to the admission of the laity, while primus Eden and the bishop of St. Andrews were favourable.¹ The subject was reopened at a conference of the College of Bishops on 27th March 1873, when they took into consideration "Suggestions towards a Canon of the Government of this Church," and caused the paper to be published and circulated. These "Suggestions" contained a complicated scheme by which the laity were to be represented in the diocesan and general synods, but were to have no voice in any purely spiritual matters.² This was followed by the circulation of a legal opinion on "The Case of the Three Bishops" opposed to the lay claims.³ The subject was left undetermined until the General synod of 1876 opened an undisputed field for lay co-operation in the Representative Church Council.

The objection to the presence of the laity in synods has always been grounded upon one plea—the protection of doctrine from lay discussion. It might be inferred from the frequent recurrence of this form of objection that the clergy in diocesan synods are in the habit of discussing doctrinal subjects, and that the laity are eager

¹ *Scot. Guardian*, Dec. 1870, pp. 15-19.

² *Ibid.* April 1873, p. 295.

³ *Ibid.* p. 329.

to share in their discussions. As a matter of fact the laity have expressed no desire to meddle with doctrinal questions, and, what is perhaps still more worthy of remark, it seldom falls to the lot of the clergy to give their opinion upon any question of doctrine in a diocesan synod. Only once, in one generation, in one diocesan synod—the Aberdeen synod in the Cheyne case—has it happened that the clergy have been asked for their opinions upon a doctrinal subject, and as the bishop in giving judgment was not necessarily bound by the canons to concur with the opinions of his presbyters, they might as well have been silent. When the canonical status of the clergy, especially as to matters of doctrine in diocesan synods, is better realised, there will be less disposition to debar the laity from the same limited rights. Their counsel might be helpful towards the solution of some of the serious problems of our age, such as the growing alienation of certain classes from religious ordinances, and other matters, which demand consideration from both laity and clergy. As at present constituted and controlled, diocesan synods may be classified as among the least profitable of the recognised institutions of Episcopacy.

The General synod, which was held at Edinburgh in October and November 1876, made no radical changes in the canons as had been done in 1863. More explicit regulations were made for the formation of incumbencies and the opening of new missions. Licensed presbyters, who had officiated continuously for two years in a diocese, became thereby members of diocesan synod. The composition of the General synod was also enlarged by the admission of one representative for every ten, or fraction of ten, members of synod in each diocese. The chief business, however, of the General synod was to give

canonical sanction to the Representative Church Council which had been recently organised for the administration on a broader basis of the Church's financial affairs.

Since the formation, in 1838, of the Scottish Episcopal Church Society, the poorer congregations had been assisted from its funds by annual grants in aid. The system, after fully thirty years' experience, was found to be unsatisfactory; it failed to unite the congregations by any other tie than the eleemosynary one of giving and receiving. With the expansion of the Church something more was needed to bring rich and poor congregations closer together—a broader system of finance based on the collective interests of all the congregations. This led to the adoption, in 1871, of the Equal Dividend Scheme, by which each congregation contributes to a central fund—the Clergy or Sustentation Fund; and the incumbents of the contributing charges receive in return an equal dividend, supplementary to the local stipend. For the working of this larger scheme, and for the development of the Church's agencies in other directions, the Representative Church Council was formed in 1876. Its members include the bishops, all clergymen whether instituted or licensed, certain lay officials and diocesan representatives, together with a layman from each incumbency and mission. The Sustentation of the clergy, Home and Foreign missions, Endowment of charges, Day schools, a Theological college, a Training institution for teachers, and a superannuation Fund for aged and infirm clergy, constitute the chief objects of the Council. There are Boards for its several schemes, with an Executive Committee; and the annual meeting of the Council is held at different large towns in rotation in the second week of October. The amount collected for the various schemes is at present (1895) about £23,000 a year, exclusive of legacies. In

addition to this sum the Walker Trust, constituted under the Will of the Misses Walker of Coates, distributes about £5000 annually for various ecclesiastical purposes. The funds administered by the Council are distinct from the local finances of the different congregations, which reach an aggregate of £41,000 a year,¹ the average stipend to each rector being about £262, inclusive of the Equal Dividend, and other grants from central funds.²

The decade of the seventies was notable for another development in Scottish Episcopacy—the cathedral system. The experiment of 1850 at St. Ninian's, Perth, had not been a conspicuous success,³ and nothing more was done till primus Eden made a similar effort in the diocese of Moray. The once famous shrine at Elgin, "the lantern of the north," inspiring even in its ruins, is probably not to be matched by any modern cathedral likely to be built in Scotland; but although the mediævalists cannot be surpassed in architecture they may with advantage be followed. Such at least was the opinion of "the men of Moray" when they projected the cathedral of St. Andrew, Inverness. The foundation was laid on the 17th October 1866 by Dr. Longley, archbishop of Canterbury. The church was opened in September 1869, and consecrated on Michaelmas day 1874. In the west, on the isle of Cumbrae, once a pendicle of the ancient kingdom of Cumbria, the collegiate church of the Holy Spirit, though in dimensions but a college chapel, was converted into the cathedral of the Isles, and consecrated on the 3rd May 1876. Unhappily it has failed to fulfil the expecta-

¹ This sum is for stipends alone and does not include what is raised for church building—a large amount in the present generation—for charitable purposes, and for church expenses.

² See Annual Report of R. C. C.

for 1895, p. 70.

³ St. Ninian's has recently entered upon a new and promising career, since which its cathedral has been much enlarged and enhanced in beauty.

tions of its founder and friends ; and its greatest distinction has probably been that it once numbered among its honorary canons the saintly John Keble. The cathedral of St. Mary, Edinburgh, was the largest venture of the kind. The Misses Walker, founders of the Trust already mentioned, had bequeathed their fortune of nearly a quarter of a million sterling for the benefit of the Scottish Episcopal Church.¹ Part of this money was to be used in the building of a memorial church, under the dedication of St. Mary, on their estate of Drumsheugh, Edinburgh. The plans ultimately assumed the dimensions of a cathedral, and the cost grew in proportion until it reached £110,000. The foundation was laid on 21st May 1874, by the duke of Buccleuch, and the cathedral was consecrated on the 30th October 1879, in presence of thirteen bishops, more than a hundred other clergy, and a congregation which filled the building. Dr. Magee, then bishop of Peterborough, the greatest orator on the Episcopal bench, preached in the forenoon, and the bishop of St. Andrews in the afternoon. St. Mary's is a noble edifice, and not the least worthy of the many gems of architecture of which Edinburgh can boast.²

The Roman Catholics continued to increase in Scotland, chiefly in Glasgow and other western districts, through the steady influx of Irish immigrants of the labouring class. The native Romanists did not fraternise cordially with the new settlers, and much friction arose between the different sections, as well as between priests and people. The Irish in Glasgow complained that they were being neglected in the daily ministrations of their priests, and demanded an Irish bishop as chief pastor.

¹ See *Scot. Guardian*, June 1872, p. 323.

² It is said to be next in size to St. Paul's, London, of post-Reformation

churches, and in floor area only less than St. Andrews among ancient Scottish cathedrals.

The request was granted, and for a few years a Scottish and an Irish bishop divided between them the Roman rule in the west. But the dual episcopate only deepened the discontent. In 1867 archbishop Manning was sent by Propaganda to examine and report upon the circumstances. Shortly afterwards both of the Roman bishops in Glasgow resigned, and Mgr. Eyre was appointed to the Western Vicariate, being consecrated in January 1868. This was the first step to a more forward movement. During the dissension the cry had been raised for the erection of the Roman hierarchy in Scotland. It had the support of Dr. Manning, who concluded the report of his visitation by recommending, as "the only means of remedying the existing evils and guarding against them for the future, the erection of dioceses in Scotland and the introduction of a regular hierarchy." The time, however, was not yet deemed opportune by the authorities at Rome. On the occasion of the pope's Jubilee in May 1877, a deputation of Scottish Romanists renewed the request in Rome, informing Pius IX. "when your Holiness shall be pleased to establish among us the ecclesiastical hierarchy, as you have already done in England, there will be given a fresh impulse to religion and many will return to the faith of their fathers." Some Scottish Roman Catholics were of a different opinion, and among them the venerable bishop Kyle of the Northern Vicariate, who submitted his objections in detail to the Congregation of Propaganda. Notwithstanding opposition, the next pope, Leo XIII., issued a Bull, 4th March 1878, restoring the Papal hierarchy in Scotland.¹ Two archbishoprics were created, St. Andrews and Glasgow. With St. Andrews

¹ Cardinal Pecci was elected pope on the 20th February 1878, and assumed the title of Leo XIII. Pius IX. had, on the 30th January, ratified

the plans of Propaganda for the erection of the Roman hierarchy in Scotland.—Irving's *Annals*, p. 1261.

was combined the bishopric of Edinburgh, while other four sees—Aberdeen, Dunkeld, Whithorn or Galloway, and Argyll and the Isles—were made suffragans to St. Andrews as the primatial see. Glasgow was made an independent see with the archiepiscopal title, but without suffragans.¹

The action of the papal government was treated with surprising indifference in Scotland. The press discussed the question with singular equanimity,² a marked contrast to the ebullition of British temper which had followed the "papal aggression" in England. In the Presbyterian Churches very little notice was taken of the advance of the papacy.³ It was otherwise in the Episcopal Church. The bishops regarded it as a gross violation of canon law that prelates, appointed by a foreign ecclesiastic, should assume the titles of sees occupied by a regular episcopate, and held by Scottish bishops almost since the Reformation, sometimes by favour of the State and sometimes without it. This was more especially true of the bishopric of Edinburgh, created by Charles I. in 1633, while the Episcopal Church was established, and with which Roman Catholics had had no manner of connection. In England the Roman hierarchy was careful to avoid the titles of sees actually occupied by the English bishops; in Scotland no such delicacy was observed.

On the 13th April 1878, the Scottish bishops issued a public protest against the usurpation of the Papal Court in claiming possession of the ancient Scottish sees. "They repudiated the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome and his

¹ See Papal Bull, Bellesheim, vol. iv. App. xix. pp. 414 seq.; Makower's *Constitutional Hist. of Church of England*, English translation p. 125, note 71.

² See *Scotsman*, 22nd Sept. and 23rd Nov. 1877, and the *Glasgow Herald*, 6th Sept. 1877.

³ One enthusiast informed the Free

Church Assembly that he had telegraphed to the pope to this effect: "If your projected hierarchy is proclaimed in Scotland, proceedings will be taken against you in the Court of Session." The announcement was received in the Assembly with laughter; it is not known how the telegram was received in Rome.

pretended universal supremacy over the Church of Christ, which was to usurp the office of the Lord Himself; they maintained the canonical rule of the Catholic Church that there should be but one bishop in the same see, so that the intrusion of other bishops into sees already occupied was a violation of the law of unity and a rending of the Body of Christ."¹ It might have been wiser to have treated the action of the Roman Curia with the same indifference that it showed towards the native hierarchy; but the bishops can hardly be blamed for discharging what they deemed to be a public duty, not only in the interest of the Church of which they were the guardians, but in the larger interests of the country which had suffered so disastrously from the spiritual tyranny and the corruptions of the Roman See.²

During the period covered by this chapter marked changes have taken place both in the faith and in the

¹ *Scot. Guardian*, 19th April 1878, p. 130; Bellesheim, iv. 316.

² Bellesheim, commenting upon what he calls the "singular protest" of the Scottish bishops, denies any connection between the ancient Scottish Church and the Episcopal Church, and says that the latter was forced by the Stuarts upon the people, the majority of whom were "invincibly opposed" to it. (*History*, iv. 317). It would be easy to show, and has been shown in the first vol. of this work, that the ancient Celtic Church was Episcopal and Catholic in all respects, and Roman Catholic in none; that it had absolutely no connection with the Roman See for many hundred years; and as to the "invincible opposition" of Scotsmen to Episcopacy, it was, so far as true, largely due to the last Scottish bishops of the Roman obedience, whose grossly immoral lives and persecuting spirit made Episcopacy, in any form, odious to the Scots for several generations; and partly to the combined tyranny and folly of the last two

Stuart kings, both of whom were Romanists. Dean Luckock (*History of the Church of Scotland*, p. 345) draws a distinction between the claims of the English and the Scottish bishops to the ancient sees. "The Anglican bishops," he remarks, "could claim unbroken possession of their sees. Their bishoprics had never been interrupted; their title had never fallen into disuse." The dean must have forgotten Oliver Cromwell and the Commonwealth, when crown and mitre in England went down into the dust together. If the titles to bishoprics were not "interrupted" in England during those years, English History will have to be rewritten. From 1644 to 1660 no bishop was consecrated in England; and at the Restoration of Charles II., out of twenty-seven sees then in England, only the bishops of nine sees survived. Had the Restoration been delayed ten years there would not have been a bishop left in England, as the last of the nine bishops died in 1670.

worship of the three leading Presbyterian Churches. They all now sit looser to the Westminster Confession, and have, one after another, modified the terms of subscription to it.¹ Calvinism has been slowly undermined, and the development of the "higher criticism" has otherwise modified many popular beliefs. Prosecutions for various forms of "heresy" have been instituted in all the three denominations. Mr. Fergus Ferguson, a minister of the United Presbyterian Church in Glasgow, was libelled, in 1877, for impugning several of the Westminster doctrines.² He was suspended by his presbytery, and reponed by the synod after making certain qualifications of his doctrine. Mr. David Macrae, another minister of this Church, next year made a violent attack on the Westminster dogma of Reprobation, and when charged with heresy by his presbytery, quoted the words of the Confession³ in a personal appeal to the court, asking the fathers and brethren if they honestly believed in the eternal damnation of the heathen, and of non-elect infants. Mr. Macrae was suspended *sine die*, and found freedom of utterance in a church of his own foundation.⁴ It is noteworthy that in this and in other prosecutions for heresy, the sympathies of the secular press and of the public have invariably been on the side of the man who has made the strongest assault on the hereditary creed of Presbyterians. Synods and Assemblies may libel and condemn, the press and the public approve and applaud. Reputed "heretics" are hailed as heroes.

The Established Church has also contributed to the liberalising of Scottish theology. Twelve of its ministers belonging to the advanced school, some of them eminent

¹ In 1879 the United Presbyterian Church modified the terms of subscription by a Declaratory Act; in 1889 the Established Church, and in 1892 the Free Church, followed suit.

² See Mr. Ferguson's *Reconstruction*

of the Creed, and *Additional Statements*, Glasgow, 1878.

³ See chapters iii., x., and xxxiii. of Westminster Confession.

⁴ See *The Macrae Case*, Glasgow, Mart & Sons, 1879.

for learning, published at Christmas 1879 a volume with the title *Scotch Sermons*, the object of which was "to show the direction in which thought is moving." In the preface it is stated that the volume "originated in the wish to gather together a few specimens of a style of teaching which increasingly prevails among the clergy of the Scottish Church."¹ Several of the sermons were of exceptional ability, and, like some of the Oxford "Essays and Reviews," so safe and colourless in doctrine that they might, but for their suspicious company, have escaped adverse comment. The teaching of others was more objectionable from the old-fashioned orthodox standpoint. One of the writers was dealt with for unsound teaching, and probably saved himself from deposition in the Assembly by retractations and an apology. Another afterwards resigned his charge, and published a work in which he implicitly repudiated the whole supernatural element in Christianity. The Established Church has earned the gratitude of scholars for contributions to theological literature of a more solid and permanent character from the pens of the late principal Tulloch and professor Milligan, and from principal Caird and professor Flint.

The Free Church, once supposed to be the most orthodox of communions, has been affected more than the others by the modern *zeitgeist* and the "higher criticism." For some years it has been intellectually the most active of the three Presbyterian Churches. Its professors and ministers have, by their published works, helped to redeem the north country from the southern reproach that there was no Scottish school of theology. The modern school is pronouncedly broad, full of the new wine of Germany, and the new wine has more than once threatened to burst the old bottles. Four Free Church professors have been

¹ *Scotch Sermons*, Macmillan & Co., 1880.

in trouble by turns, and others were not unsuspected. Professor Robertson Smith of Aberdeen, in articles contributed to the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, on the subjects of "Angels" and the "Bible," rejected as unreliable the current traditions as to the date and authorship of the Pentateuch—especially of the book Deuteronomy—and of the Psalms, minimised the predictive element in the prophets, and stated that the synoptic Gospels were not written by the men whose names they bear, but were "non-apostolic digests of spoken and written apostolic tradition." For this teaching he was libelled, and appeared at the bar of the Assembly in 1877. He made an able and ingenious defence of his speculations, and escaped with a solemn admonition from the chair. Shortly afterwards, another article from his pen appeared in the same publication on the "Hebrew Language and Literature," which his critics pronounced to be still more heterodox. After prolonged agitation and conflicts in the Church courts and in the public press, the Assembly of 1881, by 394 to 231 votes, removed him from his chair.¹ Dr. Marcus Dods was, in 1878, "admonished" by the Assembly for unguarded language in a sermon on Inspiration, and had to withdraw it from circulation. Again, in 1890, after he was professor, several of his writings were challenged as being unsound on the authority of Scripture, and on the Divinity, the Atonement, and the Resurrection of Christ. The College committee reported to the Assembly that there were no sufficient grounds for process against the professor, while they animadverted on the latitudinarian tendency of his concessions to heterodox opinion. At the same Assembly the views of professor Bruce in his book on "the Kingdom of God" were challenged as being unsound

¹ Dr. Norman Walker's *Chapters* 271-297, on the Rise of the Critical from F. C. History, chapter xvii. pp. Movement.

on the Divinity of Christ, on the supreme authority of Scripture, and on the inspiration and trustworthiness of the Evangelists. Both professors were let off with a mild censure from the Assembly.¹ In 1895, Professor Henry Drummond, the popular author of *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*, was the subject of twelve overtures from presbyteries to the Assembly complaining of much unsettlement of the faith by his recent work on *The Ascent of Man*. Principal Rainy, who has been throughout the diplomatic mediator between the men of the old and new schools, while expressing sympathy with the alarm prevailing in the Church, carried a motion to the effect that the professor's speculations should be meanwhile left to the "ordinary processes of discussion both as to their scientific grounds and possible theological bearings."²

Two Scottish dioceses became vacant in 1883. Dr. Suther, bishop of Aberdeen, died at San Remo on the 23rd January, and bishop Mackarness of Argyll and the Isles at Brighton on the 20th April. For the see of Aberdeen, the rev. and hon. A. G. Douglas, and the rev. Dr. Dowden, principal of the Theological college, were nominated. Mr. Douglas was elected by 21 clerical and 16 lay votes, as against 13 clerical and 9 lay votes for Dr. Dowden. Mr. Douglas was consecrated the 50th bishop of Aberdeen in the see city on the 1st May 1883.³ A successor to bishop Mackarness was found in the very reverend A. Chinnery-Haldane, incumbent of Ballachulish and dean of the diocese, who was unanimously elected on the 13th June, and consecrated at Fort-William on the Feast of St. Bartholomew following, the sermon, in Gaelic, being preached by canon Hugh M'Coll.⁴

¹ *Proceedings of F. C. Assembly*, 1890, pp. 68-121 and 145-179, with special Reports of College committee.

² *Proceedings of the F. C. Assembly*,

1895, pp. 116-132.

³ MS. Reg. of the Coll. of Bishops, iv. 154-161.

⁴ *Ibid.* iv. 162-169.

As the year 1884 was approaching, Scottish Episcopalians were reminded that it was the centenary of perhaps the brightest incident in their chequered history during the last century—the consecration of Dr. Seabury, first bishop of the United States. The centenary service, held at Aberdeen, the place of Seabury's consecration, in the second week of October, was ante-dated by a month to coincide with the annual meeting of the Church Council. There was a large and representative gathering in the granite city of the friends of the Episcopal Church from both sides of the Atlantic. Eighteen bishops—six Scottish, five American, two English, two Irish, and three Colonial—upwards of two hundred other clergy, and many of the leading laymen of the Church were present. The presence of Dr. Williams, the latest successor of Dr. Seabury in the see of Connecticut, added a special interest to the occasion. From the American bishops he brought an address to the Scottish bishops, and from the Convention of his own diocese he presented a massive silver paten and chalice to the bishop of Aberdeen, "as representing the Scottish Church." The Aberdeen churchmen responded by the gift of a pastoral staff to the bishop of Connecticut and his successors in office. There was much enthusiasm at the different meetings, and it reached the climax when Dr. Whipple, the venerable bishop of Minnesota, affectionately known in his own country as the "Apostle of the Indians," declared that the Episcopal Church, in the old country and in the new, had the promise of the future as the Church of the Reconciliation, destined in God's good Providence to unite a dismembered Christendom on the basis of "Evangelical Truth, Apostolic Order." The effect of the commemoration was to confirm the "Beloved Concordat" between the Scottish Episcopal Church and her prosperous offspring in the United States. "The

Seabury consecration," said one of the American clergy, "will always be the poetic incident in American Church history." Upon the actual anniversary, the 14th November, commemorative services were held both in this country and in America, not the least memorable being the service in St. Paul's cathedral, London, where a congregation of three thousand people assembled. The archbishop of Canterbury preached the sermon and told how "the feeble remnant, the Church once 'of Scotland' quietly faced the crisis of the Church of the future—how humbly and peacefully, with a knowledge of what they were doing, they laid their hands on the chosen man in an upper chamber, and imparted to the New World the gift of a 'free, valid, and purely ecclesiastical Episcopacy.'"¹

On the application of bishop Eden for a coadjutor in the bishopric of Moray, a meeting of the electors was held on the 16th July 1885, when Dr. Kelly, formerly bishop of Newfoundland, and the rev. J. Ferguson of Elgin were nominated. For the former there were 11 clerical and 6 lay votes, and for the latter 5 clerical and 5 lay votes. Bishop Kelly was accordingly elected to the coadjutorship, and on the death of bishop Eden, in August 1886, he succeeded to the see of Moray. The office of primus, which bishop Eden had held since 1862, was conferred on Dr. Jermyn, bishop of Brechin.²

Dr. Cotterill, bishop of Edinburgh, died on the 16th April 1886, and the clergy and laity entitled to take part in the election of his successor met on the 1st June, when Dr. H. P. Liddon, canon of St. Paul's, was elected bishop by a majority of 24 to 2 votes in the

¹ See Seabury Centenary Report for full account of proceedings, and *Scottish Guardian*, 10th, 17th, and 24th October 1884. MS. Reg. of the Coll. of Bishops, iv. 184-189

and 192-198.

² MS. Reg. of the Coll. of Bishops, iv. 209-215; *Scot. Guardian*, 1885, p. 358, and 1886, pp. 428, 457, 479.

clerical, and 20 to 2 votes in the lay chamber—10 of the clerical electors declining to vote.¹ Dr. Dowden, whose name had been mentioned in connection with the vacant bishopric, refused to allow himself to be nominated in opposition to canon Liddon.² At the time of the election canon Liddon was travelling in the east, and he wrote from Constantinople declining to accept the bishopric.³ His reasons for declining are worthy of record. In his letter of 7th June 1886, after a reference to the state of his health, which rendered it "at least doubtful whether he ought to undertake new and very serious duties," he proceeded to say—"There is another consideration on which I have in former times insisted with others, and which I could hardly set aside in my own case without inconsistency. In order to bring the true claims of the Church in Scotland before the mind of the Scottish people, with reasonable hope of success, it is important that her rulers and chief ministers should be Scotchmen. With Englishmen for bishops, she will always, I fear, appear a foreign system in the eyes of a patriotism so naturally sensitive as that of the Scotch, and her worship and action will be described—as I often regret to hear it described in Scotland—as that of the '*English*' Church. I have not a drop of Scottish blood in my veins, so far as I know. This consideration would, no doubt, have been present to the mind of the electors, but they could not have known—as I know too well—how little I could offer that would outweigh so great a disadvantage. I ought not to allow them to make the discovery when it would be too late to correct the mistake."⁴ On canon Liddon's declining the office a second election was held, on the 6th August, when Dr. Dowden, Pantonian professor of

¹ *Scot. Guardian*, 4th June 1886.

² *Ibid.* 28th May 1886.

³ *Ibid.* 18th June 1886.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 300.

Theology and canon of Edinburgh cathedral, the bishop of Brechin, and the Rev. Robert Dundas, rector of Albury, were nominated. At the first vote Dr. Dowden obtained a majority of 26 to 6 votes in the clerical chamber, but in the lay chamber 12 votes were recorded for and 12 against him, while in that chamber the same numbers voted for and against the bishop of Brechin. A second vote was accordingly taken, with the result that Dr. Dowden's election was carried by 31 to 2 votes in the clerical, and 21 to 3 in the lay chamber. Dr. Dowden was consecrated on St. Matthew's day following, in St. Mary's cathedral, by the six Scottish bishops, and Dr. Lightfoot, bishop of Durham.¹

Dr. Wilson, bishop of Glasgow and Galloway, died in his eighty-second year on the 17th March 1888, at Ayr, where he had been incumbent for fifty years. The election of his successor took place at Glasgow on the 12th July following.² The Rev. W. T. Harrison, vicar of St. James's, Bury St. Edmunds, honorary canon of Ely, and Dr. Sandford, bishop of Tasmania, were nominated for the vacant see. In the clerical chamber 29 votes were given for canon Harrison, and 11 for bishop Sandford; in the lay chamber there were 10 votes (one by proxy) for the former, and 7 for the latter. Canon Harrison having a majority in both chambers was declared to be the bishop-elect, upon which it was agreed to make the election unanimous. His consecration took place in St. Mary's, Glasgow, on the following Michaelmas day, the bishop of Iowa being the preacher.

A General Synod of the Episcopal Church met in Edinburgh, 3rd June 1890, and held several sittings in

¹ MS. Reg. of the Coll. of Bishops, iv. 226-233; *Scot. Guardian*, 13th August, and 24th September 1886.

² *Scot. Guardian* for 1888, p. 344; MS. Reg. of the Coll. of Bishops, iv. 266-273.

the months of June and October. Two important questions were supposed to be pressing for settlement—the revision of the Scottish Office and the revival of the office of metropolitan. It was understood that they were both to be considered by the synod. Before the synod met the former subject was withdrawn by the bishops from the list of business, and the latter, after discussion, was thrown out, the lower chamber being strongly opposed to the resumption of the title and powers of metropolitan in the present circumstances of the Church. The legislation accomplished by the synod turned largely on certain details of nomenclature. The primus was to be styled “most reverend,” as primates were by use and wont; the beneficed clergy were no longer to be incumbents but rectors, resuming the pre-Reformation title; the congregational lay representative for the election of a bishop was hereafter to be known as lay elector; the familiar term “College of Bishops,” dating from the makeshift administration of the previous century, disappeared from the canons; and the title “General Synod” gave place to Provincial Synod, the old historic name for the Church’s national councils. One more step was taken to extend the privileges and utilise the services of the laity. With the permission of the bishop and the rector laymen may now on special occasions address congregations. A new canon was introduced on cathedrals, and another was added regulating the formation and defining the status of mission congregations. Under the previous canons an instituted clergyman had the power of excluding the bishop from any but strictly Episcopal functions in his church. The legislation of this synod went to the opposite extreme. It was now made competent for a bishop, as “Chief Pastor of the Diocese,” to perform all duties pertaining to the pastoral office in every church within

there are many in Scotland who heartily re-echo the voice, and in the next century the wilderness may blossom as the rose.¹

Bishop Wilkinson, who had resigned the see of Truro from failing health, which at this date was happily restored, was unanimously elected, on the 9th February 1893, bishop of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane. He was enthroned in St. Ninian's cathedral, Perth, on the 27th April following.²

Looking back upon the century which has run since the Episcopal Church was freed from persecution, and comparing its condition in 1792 and in 1892, a remarkable progress is apparent. The progress, however, has been chiefly in the latter half of this century, and is due, in some measure, to the increase of Irish and English families in Scotland. Episcopacy was slow to recover from the depressing effects of long statutory proscription, and only with the impulse of the Oxford movement did it rise to anything like a quickened life. Its congregations, including missions and private chapels, have since increased more than sevenfold. Ecclesiastical buildings have improved proportionately in appearance. Churches have been built in better taste and at greater cost, from the stately cathedral in the city to the little Gothic church in the village. New churches, parsonages, and schools have in many charges been the work of a single generation, and some of the churches are not unworthy of comparison with those of the older foundations when architecture was in its prime.

¹ Bishop Wordsworth was a prolific writer. From his first essay (the Latin Prize Poem at Harrow in 1827) to his latest work (*Annals of my Life*) in 1892, his publications, including pamphlets and charges as well as books, number not less than

eighty-five, some few of the latter consisting of two or three volumes. List by canon Farquhar, Perth.

² MS. Reg. of the Coll. of Bishops. Draft minutes of the election Dioc. St. Andrews. Farquhar's *Hist of Perth*, pp. 414, 415.

The change in the style of ecclesiastical fabrics has not been more marked than the change in the character of public worship. Both changes are equally notable in the Presbyterian and in the Episcopal Church. The Presbyterians have developed into Gothic church builders, and have diversified if not enriched their service with sundry "innovations." It is not improbable, although it may be disputed, that the advance in both directions made by Episcopalians has had an influence upon the style of church and the character of service now adopted by Presbyterians. The change, however, in the forms of public worship has been the greatest among Episcopalians, little as it is suspected by some of themselves. The extempore prayers, the long sermon, the infrequent communions, the black gown, the slovenly ritual, the archaic precentor with the rude music and without the aid of "godless" instruments, the mean-looking kirk, barn-like without and bare within, all belonged to the Episcopal Church as by law established, and for some years after its disestablishment. The Episcopal Church when established offered little to the Scottish nation of either faith or worship which it did not already possess—offered nothing, in short, but her Episcopal polity, and that in such a shape as caused it not unnaturally to be identified with despotism. This is a historical fact which should not be forgotten. Under happier auspices the Episcopal Church has recovered her Catholic heritage, and now presents a fairer ideal both of primitive truth and of liturgic worship.

Another change, not less remarkable and more pregnant with far-reaching consequence, is the change in the theological thought of the age. We live in a different religious world from that of the fathers who saw the opening of the century. Articles of Religion and Confessions of Faith have been put into the crucible of modern

criticism, and are likely to be much transformed in the process, if, indeed, they survive at all. The Bible has been subjected to a kind of "free-handling" which would have shocked the faith of our fathers, and, we may fear, has not strengthened that of their children. Churches have modified their terms of creed subscription, and thousands of churchmen in different ranks of life have altered their attitude both to creeds and to churches. And the end is not yet. The age is confessedly transitional, and "the higher criticism" has not spoken its last word. It is possible that out of the flux of modern thought the Nicene creed, suggested by the last Lambeth conference "as a sufficient statement of the Christian faith," may prove the rallying-ground of the twentieth, as it erst was of the fourth century, the bond of concord between all who profess themselves Christians. Were it accepted *bona fide*, Articles of Religion and Confessions of Faith might alike be relegated to the shelf as relics of religious controversies which have been happily outlived.

The cleavage between those who profess some form of Christianity and those who hold to none, marks another change more ominous for the future of religion in Scotland. At the beginning of this century probably not one Scotsman in a hundred stood openly aloof from religious ordinances. To-day, many in all classes of the people have drifted away from allegiance to any form of religious belief. And every year the gulf seems to be widening, especially between the Church and the masses of the poor in our cities and towns. It is possible, however, to exaggerate the evil and to take too pessimistic a view of the situation. The shield fortunately bears another and brighter side. The Christian religion has in one important aspect a firmer hold upon our nation at the present day than in many ages past. There is now manifested, and

not least among the leisured classes, a spirit of zeal and self-sacrifice, both for the religious and for the social welfare of their fellow-men, which would be looked for in vain in the spiritual torpor of the last century. While the state of things is in some respects worse, it is also in many respects better both in the Church and, through it, in society. But the cleavage is deeper between the best and the worst. If the non-religious element in the population continues to increase in the first quarter of the coming century at the same rate as it has done in the last quarter of this, the friends of religion will in the next generation have a formidable foe to face. The wide-spreading apathy and indifference to religion, the coarse materialism and immorality which are so conspicuous and unabashed in some of the higher as well as in the lower grades of society, is a solemn call to Christians of every communion to be up and doing.

And it is a call to something more. It is obvious to every eye that the weakness of present-day religion springs largely from sectarian divisions. Strength is spent by competing sects not so much in fighting the common foe as in efforts to eclipse each other. The folly of this becomes every day more apparent with the increase of lapsed and lapsing numbers of the community. As a consequence, the desire for union has been expressed in many quarters with a force that is phenomenal as well as hopeful. Probably no such universal feeling in favour of religious unity has been manifested since the Reformation. So far good. But deliverance from sectarian divisions will only come through a much deeper sense of their evil and their shame, as a sin against the Divine Head of the Church, a violation of His will and of His prayer for unity, a wrong to the members of His Body alienated on earth from each other, and a more grievous wrong to such as

are, or are being, alienated from religion altogether. In the quickened sense of the wrong lies the hopefulness of the present movement after reunion. But the reunion will not be soon or easily effected. The causes of estrangement lie deep-rooted in the history of the past, and it may take years of patient charity and prayer to remove them. Many panaceas for peace have been, and more still will be, offered. Large sacrifices would certainly be made by many on both sides to secure fellowship with Christian brethren, but on neither side can honourable men sacrifice what they regard as fundamental principles. The line between what is expedient and what is essential may have been often too rigidly drawn, too dogmatically asserted, in past controversies between Presbyterians and Episcopalians. The distinction certainly requires to be revised and more clearly defined in the interests both of truth and peace. And in one point at least the understanding should be clear—that uniformity of worship is no essential to unity in faith or to practical fellowship in religion.

Appeal is sometimes made to "Primitive Truth and Order" as the basis of reunion. This age, with its growing scepticism and secularism, demands still more urgently an appeal to another standard—to the primitive life and spirit of religion as taught and exemplified by the Great Teacher. Religion, as it appears in the average life of professing Christians, ministers and people, is, notwithstanding many examples of a nobler type, but a feeble representation, too often a caricature, of the Christianity of Christ. A new and deeper reformation is needed in the spirit and practice of religion, more than in ecclesiastical forms or formularies.

In the history traced in these pages some record has been given of brave and good men in all ranks, who were the savour of life and the salt of the earth in their day. If Christians of this age, leaving the narrowness and

intolerance which were in some measure the evil heritage of the times, would emulate the zeal, the devotion, the fervent piety of the Church's noblest servants in the past, her travail after unity would be the sooner accomplished. "The vision is yet for the appointed time, and it hasteth toward the end." May the One Lord of All hasten it in His time.

AUTHORITIES CITED IN VOL. II

ACTS OF PARLIAMENT, SCOT.

Acts of General Assemblies, *passim*

Acts of Free Church Assemblies, 1890, 1895

Airy, Osmund : The Lauderdale Papers, Camden Society

Aiton, John : Life of Alex. Henderson. Edin. 1836

Alexander, Lindsay : Memoirs of Dr. Wardlaw, 1856

Anderson : Colonial Church, 3 vols. 1856

Arnot, Criminal Trials, 4°, 1785

BAILLIE, Robert : Letters, etc. 3 vols. Edin. 1842

Balfour, Sir James : Works, 4 vols. ed. 1824-25

Bannatyne, R. : Memorials of Transactions in Scot. 1806

Bellesheim : Hist. Cath. Ch. Eng. Translation, 4 vols. 1890

Benham, W. : Dictionary of Religion, 1887

Blackwell, Professor Thomas : Letters from Spalding Club

Blatch, W. : Life of Bishop Low, 1855

Bonar : Life of Saml. Rutherford, Pref. to Sermons, 1885

Book of Bon Accord, ed. Jos. Robertson, 1839

Book of Universal Kirk, Bannatyne Club, 3 vols. 1840

Boswell : Tour to Hebrides, 1786

Bowdler, John : Memoirs of, by Thos. Bowdler, 1825

Bower : Hist. Univ. Edinburgh, 2 vols. 1817

Brodie's Diary, Spalding Club, 1863

Brown, T. : Annals of the Disruption, 1893

Bryce, James : Ten Years of Ch. of Scot. 2 vols. 1850

Buchanan, Robert : The Ten Years' Conflict, 2 vols. 1849

Buckle, H. T. : Hist. of Civilisation, 3 vols. 1882

Burnet, G., bishop : History of his own Time, 4 vols. 1815

Burnet, G. : Vindication of Ch. and State in Scot. 1673

Burnet, G. : Memoir of Dukes of Hamilton, 1677

Burnet, G. : Life of Bedell, 1685

Burt, Captain : Letters, 2 vols. 1754

Burton, J. H. : Hist. Scot. 8 vols. 1873

CALAMY, E. : History of his Life and Times, 2 vols. 1830

Calderwood : Hist. Ch. Scot. 7 vols. Edinburgh 1842

- Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, Charles II. 3 vols. 1860-64
 Campbell, J. M'Leod : The Nature of the Atonement, 3rd ed. 1869
 Campbell, J. M'Leod : Memorials of, 2 vols. 1877
 Cardwell, E. : History of Conferences, 1840
 Carlyle, Alex. of Inveresk : Autobiography, 1860
 Carstares, Wm. : State Papers. Edin. 1774
 Chambers, R. : Domestic Annals of Scotland, 3 vols. 1859
 Chambers's Encyclopedia, ed. 1888
 Charteris, A. H. : Life of Dr. James Robertson, 1863
 Charteris, Lawrence : Discourses in 2nd part of Case of Episcopal Clergy
 Cheyne, Patrick : Scot. Office Vindicated
 Clarendon, History, 3 vols. 1807
 Cleland : Annals of Glasgow, 2 vols. 1816
 Clerk, Sir John, of Penicuik : Memoirs of, Scot. Hist. Society, vol. xiii. 1892
 Cockburn, Lord Henry : Memorials of his Time, 1856
 Coleridge, Sir. J. T. : Memoir of John Keble, 1869
 Collier, Jer. : Ecclesiastical History, vol. vii. London 1840
 Cook, Dr. : Hist. Ch. Scotland, 3 vols. 1811
 Cook, Dr. : Life of Dr. George Hill. Edin. 1820
 Crookshank, W. : Hist. Ch. Scot. 2 vols. 1812
 Cunningham, J. : Hist. Ch. Scot. 2 vols. 1st ed. 1859
 Cunningham, W. : Reformers and Theology of Reformation, vol. iii. 1863

DALZIEL : Hist. University Edin. 2 vols. ed. 1862

De Foe : History of the Union, ed. 1786

De Foe : Memoirs of Ch. of Scot. ed. 1844

Diurnal of Occurrents, Maitland Club, 1833

Dowden, J., bishop : Annotated Scot. Com. Office, 1884

ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA, 9th ed. : Robertson Smith's Articles

FARQUHAR, Canon : Epist. Hist. of Perth, 1894

Fasti Aberdonenses, Spalding Club, 1854

Ferguson, David, Tracts by, Bannatyne Club

Ferguson, Fergus : Reconstruction of Creed, etc. 1878

Forbes, bishop William : Life of, prefixed to his *Considerationes Modestæ*

Fountainhall : Decisions, 2 vols. 1759-61

Fountainhall : Historical Notices and Observes, 2 vols. Bannatyne Club, 1848

Fraser, Sir Wm. : Memorials of the Wemyss Family, 3 vols. Edin. 1888

Froude, J. A. : History of England, 12 vols. 1875

GARDEN, Dr. : Life of Dr. John Forbes prefixed to Works, 2 tom. Amst. 1702

Gib, Adam : Display of Secession Testimony, 2 vols. 1774

Gillan, John : Life of Bishop Sage, 1714

Gledstone : Life of Whitfield, 1871

Gordon : Abridgment of Britain's Distemper, Spalding Club

Gordon, J. F. S. : Scotichronicon, vol. iv.

Gordon, James, of Rothiemay : Hist. Scots. Affairs, 3 vols. Spalding Club, 1841

Green, J. R. : History of English People, 4 vols. 1878-80

Grub, G. : Eccles. Hist. Scot. 4 vols. 1861

Guthrie, Bishop : Memoirs. Glasgow, 1747

HAILES : Memorials, etc. Glasgow, 1766

Haldanes, R. and J., Lives of, 3rd ed. 1853

Hall, Peter : Fragmenta Liturgica, 7 vols. 1848.

Hanna, W. : Memoirs of Dr. Chalmers, 4 vols. 1852

Hanna, W. : Letters of Erskine of Linlathen, 3rd ed. 1878

Hessey, J. A. : Bampton Lectures on Sunday, etc. 1880

Hetherington : Hist. Ch. of Scot. Edin. 1842

Heylin : Life of Archbishop Laud. Dubl. 1719

Historie of King James Sext. Edin. 1804.

Horner, Francis : Article in *Edin. Review*, No. xiii.

Hosack, John : Mary Queen of Scots, 2 vols. 1869

Hume, D. : Hist. of England, vol. v. London, 1854

Huntly, Marquis of : Records of Aboyne, New Spalding Club

INNES, Father Thomas : Critical Essay, 2 vols. 1729

Irving, D. : Lives of Scottish Writers, 2 vols. 1839

Irving, D. : Memoirs of Geo. Buchanan. Edin. 1817.

Irving, Joseph : Annals of our Time, 2 vols. 1837-87.

Irving, Joseph : History of Dunbartonshire, 1857

Irving, Joseph : Pamphlet on Wigton Martyrs, 1862

JAFFRAY, Alex. : Diary of, 1856

James the Sixth : Basilikon Doron

KEBLE, John : Life of Hooker, prefixed to Works, 3rd ed. 1845

Keith, Bishop : Catalogue of Scot. Bishops, 1824

Keith, Bishop : History of Affairs. Spott. Soc. 2 vols. 1844

Kerr, Rev. Dr. : The Covenants and Covenanters. Glas. 1895

Kirkton, J. : Secret Hist. Ch. Scot. ed. C. K. Sharpe. Edin. 1817

Knox, John : History of Reformation, M'Gavin's ed. ; and Knox's Works, ed. D. Laing, 6 vols. 1846, etc.

Knox, John : Book of Common Order. Glas. 1886

LAING, M. : Hist. Scot. 4 vols. 1804

Lambeth Conferences : Report of S.P.C.K. ; and Irving's Annals

Lamont, John : Diary of. Mait. Club. Edin. 1830

Lang, Andrew : "St. Andrews," 1893

Large Declaration, by Dean Balcanqual. Lond. 1639

Lathbury, T. : Hist. of Non-jurors, 1843

Law, Robert : Memorials (1638-84). Edin. 1818

Lawson, J. P. : Hist. Scot. Ep. Church, 2 vols. 1843-44

Lecky, W. E. H. : Hist. of Rationalism, 2 vols. 1872

Lecky, W. E. H. : Hist. England in Eighteenth Century, 7 vols. 1892

Lee, John, Principal : Lectures Hist. Ch. Scot. 2 vols. 1860

Lee, Robert, Professor : Reform of Ch. Scot. 1864

Leighton, Archbishop : Works and Life of, by Pearson, 2 vols. 1835

Leith-Forbes : Narrative of Scot. Catholics. Edin. 1885
 Leslie, bishop of Ross : Hist. Scot. ed. for Ban. Club, 1830
 Letters and Papers : Charles II. and Scotland. Scot. Hist. Soc. vol. xvii.
 Leven and Melville Papers. Ban. Club. 1843
 Lippe : Introduction to Wodrow's Biog. Coll. New Spalding Club.
 Livingstone, John : Life of. Wodrow Society
 Lockhart : Papers, 2 vols. 1817
 Luckock, dean : Hist. Ch. in Scot. 1892
 Lyon, C. J. : Hist. of St. Andrews, 2 vols. 1843

MACAULAY, Lord : Hist. Eng. 3 vols. 1849
 Macmillan's Mag. 1860, 1862-63
 M'Cormick, Joseph : Life of Dr. Wm. Carstairs. Edin. 1774
 Macrae, David : Macrae Case. Glas. 1879
 M'Crie, Thos. : Life of Knox, 2 vols. 1813 ; and M'Gavin's ed. 1 vol.
 M'Crie, Thos. : Life of And. Melville, ed. 1856
 M'Crie, Thos. : Life of, by his Son, 1840
 M'Dowall, Wm. : Hist. of Dumfries, 1873
 M'Kenzie, Sir George : Lives of Writers, etc. 3 vols. Edin. 1708-22
 M'Kenzie, Sir George : Memoirs of Affairs, etc. Edin. 1821
 M'Kenzie, Sir George : Vindication of Govt. in Scot. 2 vols. 1757
 M'Kerrow, John : Hist. of Secession Ch. Edin. 1841
 Maitland Club Miscellany
 Makower, Felix : Constitutional Hist. Ch. Eng. Translation, 1895
 Mant, Bishop : Hist. Ch. Ireland. Lond. 1840
 Melvil, Sir Jas. : Memoirs. Mait. Club, 1827
 Melville, James : Diary of, 1829
 Mitchell's Diary. Spalding Club, vol. i.
 Morren's Annals of General Assembly. Edin. 1838-40
 Munimenta Almæ Univ. Glas. 4 vols. 1854

NAPIER, Mark : Montrose and the Covenanters, 2 vols. 1838
 Napier, Mark : Memorials of Dundee, 3 vols. N.D.
 Neal, D. : History of the Puritans, 5 vols. 1793
 Neale, J. M. : Life of Bishop Torry, 1856
 Newman, J. H. : Apologia, 1867
 Nicoll's Diary. Ban. Club, 1836
 North British Review, 1867
 Notes and Queries, 1862, 1867

OLIPHANT, Mrs. : Life of Ed. Irving, 2 vols. 1862
 Original Letters : Reign of James Sext (Sixth). Ban. Club, 2 vols. 1851
 Original Statistical Account, vols. viii. x. xi. xv.

PALMER, W. : Appeal to Ep. Ch. in Scotland, 1847
 Peterkin, Alex. : Records of the Kirk of Scotland, 1838
 Pitcairn : Criminal Trials. Maitland Club, 3 vols. 1833
 Pitcairn : Hist. and Genealogical Acct. of Family of Kennedy. Ban. Club
 Plumptre, dean : Life of Bishop Ken, 2 vols. 1890
 Prynne : Hidden Works, 1645

- REGISTER MS. COLL. BISHOPS, 4 vols.
 Register Scots P. Council, vols. i. ii. and xi. ed. Masson, 1616-19
 Review and Mag. Scot. Ep. vols. i. ii. iii.
 Robertson, Joseph : Statuta Eccles. Scot. Ban. Club, 2 vols. 1866
 Robertson, J. C. : Hist. of Christian Ch. 2 vols. 1854-56
 Ross, A. J. : Memoir of Bishop Ewing, 1877
 Rothes, Earl of : Relation of Proceedings. Ban. Club, 1830
 Row, John : History of Kirk of Scot. 2 vols. 1842
 Rushworth, John : Historical Collections, 6 vols. 1659-1701
 Russell, M. : Life of Spottiswoode, prefixed to his History
 Rutherford, Samuel : Lex Rex. Edin. 1843
 Rutherford, Samuel : Religious Letters. Glas. 1783
- SAGE, Bishop : Fundamental Charter of Presbytery
 Sage, Bishop : Principles of Cyprianic Age. Works, 3 vols. 1844
 St. Giles's Lectures, 1st series, 1881
 Sandford, Bishop : Remains of, vol. i. Edin. 1830
 Scot, Wm. : Apologetical Narration, etc. 1846
 Scotch Sermons. Macmillan and Co. 1880
 Scott, David : Annals, etc. of Original Secess. Ch. 1886
 Scott, Hew : Fasti Eccles. Scotticanæ, 6 vols. 1866
 Scottish Review, 1884
 Scot. Eccles. Journal, *passim*
 Scot. Guardian, *passim*
 Scots Magazine, *passim*
 Seabury, Bishop : Centenary Report. Aberdeen, 1884
 Shaw : Hist. of Moray, 1775
 Shields, A. : Hind Let Loose, 1770
 Shields, M. : Faithful Contendings, 1780
 Sidney, E. : Life of Rowland Hill, 3rd ed. 1834
 Sinclair, Sir John : Stat. Account of Scot. vol. viii.
 Skelton, J. K. : Maitland of Lethington, 1887
 Skelton, J. K. : Mary Stuart, 1894
 Skinner, John : Eccles. Hist. Scot. 2 vols. 1788
 Skinner, primus John : Prim. Truth and Order, 1803
 Skinner, dean John : The Annals, etc. 1818
 Somers' Collection of Tracts, vol. iv.
 Somerville, T. : Hist. Reign of Queen Anne, 1798
 Somerville, T. : Own Life and Times, 1861
 Southey, R. : Life of Wesley, 2 vols. 1838
 Spalding Club Miscellany
 Spalding, John : Memorials of Troubles (1624-45), 2 vols. 1828
 Spottiswoode, Archbishop John : Hist. Ch. Scot. 3 vols.
 Sprott, G. W. : Scott. Liturgies Reign of James VI. Edin. 1871
 Stanhope, Earl of : Life of Pitt, 4 vols. 1861
 Stanley, dean : Church of Scot. 1879
 Stanley, dean : Christian Institutions, 1881
 State Papers Scot. vols. xvi. xvii.
 State Trials, *passim*
 Stephen, Thos. : Hist. Ch. of Scot. 4 vols. 1845

- Stewart, Arch. : Case of Wigton Martyrs, 2nd ed.
 Stewart, Dugald : Life of Dr. Robertson, 1801
 Stewart, Dugald : Statement of Leslie Case, 1805
 Stewart, Major-Gen. : Sketches of Highlanders, 2 vols. 1822
 Story, R. H. : Memoir of Rev. R. Story, Roseneath, 1862
 Story, R. H. : Life of Dr. Robt. Lee, 2 vols. 1870
 Story, R. H. : Editor Hist. Ch. of Scot. 5 vols. 1890
 Strickland, Agnes : Lives of Queens of England, vol. vii. 1840
 Struthers, G. : History of Relief Church, 1843
- TEULET, A. : Papiers d'Etat, 3 vols. Paris, 1852-60
 Teulet, A. : Relations Politiques avec l'Ecosse, 5 vols. Paris, 1862
 Thomson, A. : Origin of Secession Church. Edin. 1848
 Train, Joseph : The Buchanites from First to Last. Edin. 1846
 Turner, Sir James : Memoirs of Life, 1829
 Turner, A. : Scottish Secession of 1843, 1859
 Tytler, P. F. : Hist. Scot. 7 vols. 1845
- WALKER, Norman : Chapters from Hist. Free Church Scot. 1895
 Walker, Patrick : Biograph. Presbyteriana : Lives of Peden, Cameron, Cargill, Renwick, 2 vols. 1827
 Walker, W. : Memoirs of Bishops Jolly and Gleig, 1878
 Walker, W. : Life of John Skinner of Linshart, 1883
 Walker, W. : John Skinner, Bishop of Aberdeen, 1887
 Walker, W. : Three Churchmen, 1893
 Wellwood, Sir H. M. : Life of John Erskine, 1818
 White, Bishop : Memoirs of Prot. Ep. Ch. in America. New York, 1836
 Wilberforce, Bishop : Hist. American Church, 2nd ed. 1846
 Wilkin's Concilia, vol. iv. Lond. 1737
 Wishart, Bishop : Memoirs of Marquis of Montrose, Eng. trans. 1756
 Wishart, Bishop : edited by Murdoch and Simpson, 1893
 Wodrow, R. : History of Sufferings of Ch. Scot. 2 vols. 1721
 Wodrow, R. : Analecta, 4 vols. 1842
 Wodrow, R. : Correspondence, 3 vols. 1842
 Wodrow Society Miscellany
 Wodrow Society Miscellany : Lives of Bruce, Dickson, Blair, Livingstone
 Wodrow's Biographical Collections. New Spalding Club
 Wordsworth, Bishop Charles : Annals of my Life (1806-56), 2 vols. 1890, 1893
 Wright, Thos. : Queen Elizabeth and her Times, 2 vols. 1838

INDEX

- ABBEYS**, Scottish, foundation of, i. 285-293
 Abbeys, held by bishops *in commendam*, i. 489, 496, 497
 Aberdeen, see of, founded, i. 272 ; Cathedral, 276 ; Trinitarians or Red Friars, founded, 339, 340 ; Dominican monastery, 356 ; synodal statutes of, 373-379 ; University, King's College, founded by bishop Elphinstone in 1494, 486 ; Breviary published in 1509, 488 ; destruction of Dominican and Carmelite monasteries, 572 ; Marischal College, founded in 1593, ii. 227
 Aberdeen "Doctors," ii. 247, 248, 265, 279, 282, 284
 Aberdour, Fife, hospital, i. 481
 Abernethy, its foundation, i. 34 ; supremacy, 187, 188 ; Round Tower, 188, 189 ; decline, 260
 Abjuration Oath of 1712, ii. 472
 Adam, bishop of Caithness, murdered, i. 351
 Adamnan, St., abbot of Iona, and biographer of St. Columba, i. 58-60, 160, 162-164, 260
 Adamson, P., second titular archbishop of St. Andrews, ii. 91, 108 ; his articles on Christian ministry, 133 ; controversy with Andrew Melville, 136, 137 ; before Synod of Fife, excommunicated, 141 ; last days and death, 151-153
 Adrian, St., i. 189
 Aidan, St., bishop of Northumbria, i. 130-139, 158, 159 ; controversy as to his ordination, 131, 132
 Aikenhead, Thomas, execution of, for blasphemy, ii. 444, 445
 Ailbe, St., i. 35
 Ailred, abbot of Rievaulx, i. 6, 302, 325
 Albany, duke of, regency, i. 446-449
 Alchfrid, king of Northumbria, i. 143, 152, 157, 163
 Aless or Alesius, Alexander, Scottish Reformer, i. 507, 514
 Alexander I., king of Scots, i. 248, 252-263
 Alexander II., i. 344-359
 Alexander III., i. 381-394
 Alexander, John, bishop of Dunkeld, ii. 511
 Alison, Isabel, Covenanter, executed, ii. 390
 Anchorites, i. 230
 Andrew of Winton, prior of Lochleven, author of *Orygynale Cronykil of Scotland*, i. 442
 Angus, the Culdee, i. 112, 116
 Annand, William, minister of Ayr, ii. 256
 Anne, queen, ii. 451-453, 461, 475, 477
 Annexation, Act of, ii. 146, 147
 Anti-Burghers. See Burghers
 Arbroath abbey, i. 334, 362, 392, 466, 497
 Arbuthnot, Alexander, principal of Aberdeen University, ii. 138, 139
 Archdeacons, early Scottish, i. 281
 Archibald, bishop of Caithness, i. 397
 Architecture, style of chief ecclesiastical buildings, i. 275-280 ; its golden age in Scotland, 358
 Ardhattachan priory, i. 355
 Argyll, diocese, i. 261, 275, 324 ; its cathedral on Lismore island, 278, 341, 363, 364, 516
 Argyll, earl of, Reformer, i. 550, 567,

- 568; ii. 44, 53, 55; his share of church spoil, 84, 102
- Argyll, earl and first marquis (beheaded), ii. 273, 274, 291, 292, 308, 333, 335, 336
- Argyll, earl, son of first marquis (beheaded), ii. 360, 392, 393, 401
- Arnold, bishop of St. Andrews, i. 328, 329
- Arran, earl of, regent, i. 521-545
- Arran, James Stewart, earl of, ii. 116, 117
- Assembly, first Protestant council held in 1560, ii. 16, 17
- second, 1561, orders demolition of Religious Houses, 19
- 1565, presents six articles to queen Mary, 48, 49
- 1563 and 1568, exercise censorship of the press, 45, 46, 75, 76
- 1572, persecuting decree against papists, 101
- 1573, deals with titular bishops, 101, 102
- 1576, attempts to limit bishops to particular charges, 107
- 1578, decrees abolition of ecclesiastical titles, 115
- 1580, at Dundee, condemns titular Episcopacy, 119
- 1581, at Glasgow, appoints first presbyteries, 120, and issues Second Book of Discipline, 122
- 1590, king James's reputed speech, 150
- 1592, proposes repeal of Acts of 1584, 153
- 1598, at Dundee, appoints ministers to Parliament, 175
- 1604 and 1605, disputed Assemblies of Aberdeen, 187, 188
- 1606, at Linlithgow, appoints permanent moderators of presbytery, 193
- 1610, at Glasgow, re-establishes Episcopacy, 197-200
- 1616, at Aberdeen, issues new Confession of Faith, 215, 216
- 1618, at Perth, passes the Five Articles, 223, 224
- 1638, at Glasgow, abolishes Episcopacy, 268-275
- 1639, at Edinburgh, ratifies Presbyterianism, 280-281
- 1653, at Edinburgh, dispersed by Cromwell's soldiers, 323, 324
- 1690, the first after interval of thirty-seven years, imposes Westminster Confession, 426, 427
- Assembly of 1707, opposes use of Prayer Book in Scotland, 462
- Assertory Act, ii. 363, 364
- Assurance, Oath of, ii. 439, 441
- Auchenshauch Declaration, ii. 473
- Auchterarder Case, disputed parochial settlement, ii. 597
- Auchterarder Creed, ii. 485, 486
- Augustine, archbishop of Canterbury, i. 126
- Avignon, papal exile at, i. 436
- BAILLIE, Robert**, principal of Glasgow University, etc., ii. 256, 257, 270, 271, 280, 283, 286, 293, 296, 298, 312
- Balcanqual, Walter, Edinburgh, minister, attacks Jesuits, ii. 118, 119; disputes with king James in the kirk, 140, 141; attacks the court in sermon, 166
- Balcanqual, Walter, dean of Rochester and of Durham, member of Synod of Dort, ii. 225, 266; author of Large Declaration, 281
- Baldred St., of the Bass, i. 172
- Baliol, John, i. 404, 405
- Baliol, king Edward, i. 420
- Balmerino, Cistercian abbey, founded, i. 355; wrecked by Reformers, 567
- Balmerino, John, lord, ii. 239, 287
- Bancroft, Richard, archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 151, 191
- Barbour, John, archdeacon of Aberdeen, author of "The Bruce," i. 441, 442
- Barr, Alexander, D.D. and L.L., bishop of Moray, i. 437
- Barrier Act, ii. 445, 446
- Bartholomew, St., massacre in France, ii. 93, 94
- Basilikon Doron*, ii. 147, 177
- Basle, reforming council of, i. 452, 458
- Bassoll, John, Franciscan and philosopher, i. 400
- Beaton, James, archbishop of Glasgow, and of St. Andrews, succeeds Blackader, i. 491, 492; translated to St. Andrews, 503, 504; persecutions for heresy, 508, 509; holds provincial council in Edinburgh, 510
- Beaton, David, archbishop of St. Andrews, and cardinal, at Glasgow University, i. 461; rupture with archbishop Dunbar, 498; life of, 511-529
- Beaton, James, archbishop of Glas-

- gow, i. 533, 534; ii. 37, 113, 146
note, 181
- Beattie, Dr. James, professor and author, ii. 533
- Beaulieu priory, i. 355
- Bede, Ven., i. 144, 171
- Bellenden, Adam, bishop of Dunblane and of Aberdeen, ii. 241
- Bene or Benedict, James, bishop of St. Andrews, i. 424
- Benedict Biscop, i. 157, 171
- Benedict, St., i. 117
- Benedictines in Scotland, i. 292
- Benefices, value of, in thirteenth century, i. 388, 389
- Bernard, St., i. 216
- Bernham, David de, bishop of St. Andrews, i. 357, 381
- Berwick, Dominican and Franciscan monasteries, i. 356
- Berwick, North, nunnery, i. 326, 439
- Berwick, Treaty of, between queen Elizabeth and Scots Reformers, i. 570, 571
- Beveridge, friar, burned, i. 506
- Beza, Swiss Reformer, answers six questions of lord Glamis on the Triple Episcopate, ii. 110
- Bible, English, first introduced into Scotland A.D. 1543, i. 514; Bas-sandyne Bible, first to be printed in Scotland, 1579, ii. 116
- Biggar Collegiate Church, the last of that order, i. 431
- Birinnus, St., i. 117
- Bishops, Tribal and Diocesan, i. 87-91, 103, 105, 220
- Bishops' property and the crown, i. 439, 459
- Bishops holding abbeys and priories *in commendam*, i. 533
- Bishops, character of, preceding the Reformation, i. 530-533
- Bishops, changes in election of, i. 557-558
- Blackader, bishop and first archbishop of Glasgow, sent to Rome, i. 478; exempted from the jurisdiction of St. Andrews, 480; death of, 491
- Blain, St., of Kingarth and Dunblane, i. 277
- Blair, Dr. Hugh, professor and author, ii. 533
- Blair, John, i. 400, 401
- Blair, Robert, minister at Ayr and at St. Andrews, ii. 236, 281, 286, 309, 327
- Boece, Hector, historian and first principal of Aberdeen University, i. 487
- Boiamund de Vicci, or Bagimont, papal tax-gatherer, i. 387-389
- Boisil, St., prior, i. 142, 152
- Bondington, William de, bishop of Glasgow, i. 358, 390
- Boniface, bishop, i. 173
- Book of Discipline, First, in 1560, ii. 5-10
- Book of Discipline, Second, in 1581, ii. 122-125
- Borthwick, Sir John, burned in effigy, i. 514
- Boston, Thomas, author of *The Fourfold State*, ii. 485-487
- Bothwell Brig, battle of, ii. 387
- Bothwell, Adam, bishop of Orkney, ii. 64, 73, 81
- Bothwell, earl of, divorced from his wife, ii. 61; captured and married queen Mary, 64
- Boucher, Jonathan, vicar of Epsom, ii. 555
- Bourignonism, ii. 447-449
- Bower, Walter, i. 259, 441
- Boyd, titular bishop of Glasgow, ii. 107, 115
- Boyd, Andrew, bishop of Argyll, ii. 245-246.
- Brecbennoch, i. 79
- Brechin, Round Tower, i. 188; foundation of city, 207, 315, and of see, 274-275, cathedral, 276
- Brendan, or Brandan, St., i. 37, 70, 102
- Bricius, bishop of Moray, excommunicated and accused, i. 341, 342, 347-348
- Bride, or Bridget, St., i. 34, 102, 143, 188
- Brigham, treaty of, independence of Scottish Church and Kingdom, i. 403
- Brioc, St., i. 35
- British bishops at early Councils, i. 5
- Brown, George, bishop of Dunkeld, i. 492, 493
- Brown, John, of Priestfield, Covenantanter shot by order of Claverhouse, ii. 399
- Brown, Robert, English sectary in Scotland, ii. 132
- Bruce, king Robert, i. 404, 406-418
- Bruce, Robert, minister in Edinburgh, ii. 149, 153, 167, 176, 179, 236
- Brude, king, i. 67-70, 74
- Buchanan, George, i. 507, 515;

- moderator of Assembly, ii. 65, 66 ;
 death A.D. 1582, 128
 Buchanites, the, ii. 533-534
 Buite, or Boethius, St., i. 35
 Burghers and Anti-Burghers, ii. 521 ;
 separate into Old Lights and New
 Lights, 567 ; Old Lights join the
 Established Church A.D. 1839, 614,
 615
 Burghs, free, origin of, i. 342, 343
 Burke, Edmund, letter on R. C. Re-
 lief Bill, ii. 542
 Burnet, Alexander, bishop of Aber-
 deen, archbishop of Glasgow and of
 St. Andrews, ii. 352, 354, 360,
 362, 364, 375, 388, 397
 Burnet, Gilbert, the historian, minister
 of Salton, professor in Glasgow
 University and bishop of Salisbury,
 ii. 354, 356, 357, 366-369, 375, 408,
 468 *note*
 CADOC, St., i. 36
 Cadroë, i. 123, 208, 253
 Cainnech, St., i. 38
 Cairncross, Alexander, bishop of
 Brechin and archbishop of Glasgow,
 ii. 397, 403
 Caithness, see of, founded, i. 272-
 274
 Calderwood, David, minister of Crail-
 ing, and historian, ii. 220, 228, 229,
 272, 283
 Cambuskenneth abbey, i. 287, 439 ;
 wrecked, 568
 Cambuslang Revival, ii. 508, 509
 Cameron, John, bishop of Glasgow,
 i. 452, 453
 Cameron, Richard, Covenanter, ii.
 388-390 ; Cameronians, 473, 474 ;
 unite with Free Church in 1876,
 653, 654
 Campbell, Archibald, college bishop,
 ii. 459, 482, 489, 490
 Campbell, John M'Leod, minister of
 Row, deposed, ii. 590, 591 ; influ-
 ence of his teaching, 594
 Campbell, Neil, bishop of Argyll, ii.
 235
 Campbell, principal, of Marischal
 College, Aberdeen, ii. 525
 Canaries, Dr. James, minister at Sel-
 kirk, ii. 433
 Candida Casa. See Galloway
 Candlish, Dr., minister of St. George's,
 Edinburgh, ii. 613, 615, 617, 626,
 653
 Canons, Book of (Charles I.), ii. 243, 245
 Canons-regular of St. Augustine, i. 291
 Cant, Andrew, Covenanter, minister at
 Aberdeen, ii. 264, 281, 282, 320, 323
 Cant, Andrew, minister in Edinburgh,
 and principal of University, ii.
 376-378
 Cant, Andrew, college bishop, ii.
 491-495
 Caran, or Corindu, St., i. 161
 Cargill, Donald, Covenanter, ii. 388,
 390
 Carlyle, Alexander, minister of Inver-
 esk, ii. 424, 526
 Carmelites, or White Friars, i. 294
 Carstares, William, principal of Edin-
 burgh University, ii. 395, 420, 421,
 440, 441, 457, 467, 469, 477, 478
 Carthusians, offshoot of Benedictines,
 i. 290
 Cassillis, earl of, seizes abbey lands
 of Glenluce and Crossraguel, ii. 30
 Cathedral chapters, their constitution
 and influence, i. 280-284
 Cathedrals, Scottish, styles of archi-
 tecture, i. 271, 280 ; four modern,
 ii. 632, 666, 667
 Catherine, St., of Siena, i. 436
 Cedd, bishop of Mercia, and after-
 wards of East Saxons, i. 135, 140,
 143
 Celibacy of clergy, i. 92
 Celtic civilisation, i. 195 ; mission in
 Northumbria, Mercia, and Essex,
 126-151 ; MSS. on the continent,
 123, 124 ; MSS., scarcity of, in
 Scotland, i. 197
 Ceolfrid, abbot of Jarrow, i. 163, 169,
 171
 Chad, bishop of York, and afterwards
 of Mercia, i. 135
 Chalmers, Dr. Thomas, ii. 584, 585,
 595, 613, 614, 618, 619, 621, 625
 Chapels of Ease, ii. 559, 596
 Chapters, Scottish, their rights super-
 seded by papal see, i. 429
 Charles I., accession and marriage, ii.
 230, 231 ; secures teinds for clergy,
 232, 234 ; establishes parish schools,
 235 ; is crowned in Holyrood Abbey
 and holds Parliament, 236-239 ;
 his ecclesiastical policy, 243 ; second
 visit to Scotland, 288, 289 ; contro-
 versy with Henderson, 304 ; sur-
 rendered by the Scots to the English,
 306 ; execution, 310
 Charles II. at the Hague, ii. 312, 313 ;
 at Breda, 315 ; in Scotland, 316 ;
 coronation at Scone, 318, 319 ;
 letter to Edinburgh Presbytery,
 337, 338 ; his death, 396, 397

- Charles Edward, prince, ii. 515-517 ;
his death, 550
- Charteris, Lawrence, professor in
Edinburgh University, and minister
of Dirleton, ii. 368, 429
- Charters first used in Scotland, i. 258
- Cheyne, Henry le, bishop of Aber-
deen, i. 409
- Cheyne, Patrick, incumbent of St.
John's, Aberdeen, ii. 638 ; trial and
deposition for false doctrine, 639,
640
- Chisholm, William, bishop of Dun-
blane, i. 531, 578
- Chisholm, William (II.), bishop of
Dunblane, ii. 37, 58, 71
- Christian Year, observance of, in Celtic
Church, i. 94, 95, 105
- Christie, Henry, college bishop, ii.
459
- Church Council, first in Scotland, i.
200
- Church Service Society, ii. 649
- Church Society, Scottish Episcopal,
founded 1838, ii. 605, 606
- Ciaran, St., i. 102
- Ciricus, St., i. 193
- Cistercians, or White Monks, i. 293 ;
their abbeys, 325, 326
- Clement, bishop of Dunblane, builder
of cathedral, i. 277, 358
- Cluniacs, reformed Benedictines, i.
290, 292
- Coldingham, convent under St. Ebba,
i. 142 ; priory refounded, 248, 249,
259, 288, 292
- Coldstream, Cistercian convent, i. 326
- Collegiate Churches founded, i. 430-
432
- "College" bishops, origin of, ii. 456 ;
end of 499
- Colman, or Colmoc, St., i. 35
- Colman, bishop of Northumbria, i. 143
- Columba, St., i. 32, 57-83, 185, 187
- Columban Church, decline of, i. 211-
213
- Columbanus, St., i. 106, 117-125
- Comgan, St., missionary to the Picts,
i. 161, 162
- Conference of queen Margaret and
Scottish clergy, i. 233-238
- Confession of Faith, first, i. 577-579 ;
ii. 4, 5 ; Swiss (Helvetian), presented
to Scots Reformers, ii. 60
- Confession, Negative, or the King's
Confession, ii. 120, 266
- Confession, Westminster, ii. 306
- "Congregation, The," name assumed
by Reformers, i. 564, 566, 570, 571
- Congregational Union of Scotland
formed, ii. 566
- Consecration of three Scottish bishops
in London A.D. 1610, ii. 201-203 ;
and of four bishops in A.D. 1661, 345
- Conservator of Provincial Council first
appointed A.D. 1225, i. 351, 437
- Constance, Council of, i. 449
- Constantin I., king of Scots, i. 186
- Constantin II., king and abbot, i. 199
et seq.
- Constantin III., king, i. 210
- Continuity, historical, of Scottish
Church, ii. 442, 443
- Corbett, John, minister of Bonhill, ii.
279
- Cormac, bishop of Dunkeld, i. 260
- Coronation, ceremony of anointing at,
i. 419
- Coronation Oath, i. 420 ; ii. 72, 412,
413
- Corrichic, battle of, 1562, defeat and
death of earl of Huntly, ii. 41
- Cotterill, Henry, bishop of Edin-
burgh, ii. 643, 644
- Coupar - Angus Cistercian abbey, i.
325
- Court of Session founded, i. 510
- Covenant, the National, ii. 260-262,
281
- Covenant, the Solemn League and, ii.
293
- Covenanters, persecution of. See under
Persecutions
- Cowper, William, bishop of Galloway,
ii. 208, 209
- Craig, John, colleague to Knox in St.
Giles', ii. 31, 59, 79, 88, 106, 120
- Crawar, Paul, burned, i. 454
- Crinan, lay abbot of Dunkeld, i. 216,
222
- Cromwell and the Covenanters, ii.
308, 309, 318
- Cross, use of sign in Celtic Church, i. 97
- Crossraguel abbey, i. 355 ; its abbacy
robbed, ii. 30
- Croyser, William, archdeacon of
Teviotdale, papal agent, i. 453
- Crusade, seventh, joined by earls of
Atholl and Carrick, i. 386, 387
- Culdees, the, their origin and history,
i. 307-322
- Culdees of Lochleven, i. 203, 222,
230, 231, 239, 269, 270, 313
- Culdees of St. Andrews, i. 269, 313,
314, 317-320
- Culross Cistercian abbey, i. 355
- Cumbræ, Collegiate church and
cathedral, modern, ii. 666

- Cumine, abbot of Iona, i. 58, 160, 161
- Cumyn, William, bishop of Brechin, i. 397
- Cuthbert, St., bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 136, 142, 152, 159.
- DAGAN, Irish bishop, *versus* the Roman bishops, i. 127
- Danes' last attack upon Iona, i. 213
- Daniel, bishop of Kingarth, i. 141
- Darnley, lord (Henry Stuart), marriage to queen Mary, ii. 51; his character, 51, 59, 62; sickness and murder, 62, 63
- David, prince of Cumbria, i. 261; and king (David I.) of Scotland, 264-306
- David, bishop of Moray, i. 416
- David II., king, i. 419-432
- Deaneries, rural, early Scottish, i. 281, 282
- Deer, Book of, i. 195, 196
- Deer, St. Drostan's foundation, i. 73; reconsecration of Monastery Church, 260; Cistercian abbey, 285, 355, 438
- Degrees, University, reckoned popish, ii. 213, 214
- Dickson, David, minister and professor, ii. 236, 258, 264, 309, 323
- Dioceses and parishes, i. 102, 182
- Directory, Westminster, ii. 299, 300
- Disabilities Bill, Scottish Episcopal clergy, of 1840, ii. 607; of 1864, 645, 646
- Dispensations, papal, i. 422-424
- Disruption controversy before 1843, ii. 613-622; the Disruption, 623, 624
- Dominicans or Black Friars, i. 294, 355, 356
- Donnan, St., i. 112
- Dornoch Cathedral, i. 282
- Dort, Synod of, ii. 225
- Douglas, Gavin, bishop of Dunkeld, i. 492, 495, 503
- Douglas, hon. A. G., bishop of Aberdeen, ii. 674
- Douglas, John, rector of St. Andrews, and its first titular archbishop, ii. 85; his professed consecration, 91, 101
- Douglas, Robert, minister of Kirkcaldy and of Edinburgh, ii. 278, 290, 293, 313, 321, 332, 333, 362
- Dowden, John, bishop of Edinburgh, ii. 677, 678
- Drumceatt, convention of, i. 71
- Drumclog, skirmish at, ii. 386
- Drummond, Dr. Abernethy, bishop of Brechin and of Edinburgh, ii. 547, 548, 551, 557, 593 *note*
- Dryburgh abbey, i. 287, 517
- Dull, abbacy of, i. 260
- Dunbar, monastery for Trinity or Red Friars, i. 355
- Dunbar Carmelite monastery, i. 392
- Dunbar, battle of, i. 405
- Dunbar, second battle, Cromwell and Leslie, ii. 317
- Dunbar Collegiate Church, first of that order, i. 430
- Dunbar, Gavin, archbishop of Glasgow, i. 510
- Dunbar, Gavin, bishop of Aberdeen, i. 535
- Dunbar, friar William, "the Rhymer of Scotland," i. 503
- Dunbar, William, bishop of Moray, ii. 495; and of Aberdeen, 510
- Dunbarton as Alclud, i. 39, 114; Parish Church of St. Mary, 284, 288; Collegiate Church of St. Mary, 460
- Dunblane, see of, founded, i. 274; its cathedral, 277, 358
- Duncan, Alexander, bishop of Glasgow, ii. 493, 499, 509
- Dundee, council at, i. 413; dispute about patronage of Parish Church, 466; destruction of monasteries, 526
- Dundrennan abbey, i. 288
- Dunfermline palace, church and abbey, i. 225, 229, 259, 263, 286, 363, 365, 382; wrecked, 568
- Dunkeld, Celtic foundation, i. 79, 185, 187; restoration of see, 259-261; its cathedral, 277, 364, 484, 492, 493
- Dunnottar Castle, Covenanters confined in, ii. 402
- Dunoon Parish Church, mensal to see of Argyll, i. 471
- Durham, foundation of cathedral in 1093, i. 243; relics of St. Cuthbert placed in church, 259
- Durrow, Book of, i. 62, 80, 99, 124
- Duthac, St., of Tain, i. 232, 483
- EADMER, historian, i. 254; chosen for see of St. Andrews, 256, 257
- Easter festival in Celtic Church, i. 95; and cycle, 118-120, 142 *et seq.*, 169, 170, 180
- Eastern Church, negotiations for union

- with, in 1716, ii. 482-484; and in 1849, 628-630
- Eata, bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 135, 142, 152, 155
- Ebba, St., founds convent at Coldingham, i. 142
- Eccles, Cistercian convent, i. 326
- Eden, Robert, bishop of Moray, etc., ii. 632
- Edinburgh — Dominican monastery founded, i. 356; Trinity Collegiate Church and Hospital, 459, 471 *note*; St. Giles' Church made collegiate, 473; council at, 510; convention at, 523; Parliament of 1560 abrogates papal jurisdiction in Scotland, accepts first "Confession of Faith," and sets up a Reformed Protestant Church, 574-580; Court of Session founded A.D. 1532, 510; provincial councils at, years 1549-1552, 538-540; 1559, 555-560; treaty of, 574; "No Popery" riot in 1596, ii. 167; bishopric erected, 239, 240; Cathedral, St. Mary's, modern, 667
- Edgar, Henry, bishop of Fife, ii. 529
- Edgar, king, i. 247-252
- Education Acts—the first, i. 488; archbishop Spottiswoode establishes grammar schools, ii. 217; Act of Charles I., 234, 235; Acts of 1696 and of 1872, 445
- Egbert, archbishop of York, i. 168, 170, 171
- Egilsay, Orkney, Round Tower, i. 251
- Eig, monastic foundation, i. 73, 112
- Elgin, Dominican monastery founded, i. 356; its cathedral, 275, 437, 438; last mass celebrated in 1595, ii. 161
- Elizabeth, queen, helps the Scottish Reformers, i. 555, 570, 571
- Elphinstone, William, bishop of Aberdeen, i. 461, 473, 478, 485-488
- Engagement, the, with Charles I., ii. 307
- English clergy expelled from Scotland, i. 408, 470
- English Prayer-Book in Scotland, i. 551, 552
- Episcopal Church, responsibility for its disestablishment in 1690, ii. 417; its Jacobitism, 452, 453
- Episcopal elections, mediæval examples of, i. 365, 416
- Episcopalians, their numbers at Revolution, ii. 421-424; and in 1792, after a century of persecution, 552, 553
- Episcopate, Titular, ii. 90
- Episcopus, "Primus," i. 3, 187
- Erskine of Dun, superintendent of Angus in Reformed Church, i. 547, 550; ii. 85, 86, 88, 135, 137, 149
- Erskine, Ebenezer, ii. 487, 503-505; forms the Associate Presbytery, 506, 521
- Erskine, Ralph, ii. 487, 507, 508, 521
- Erskine, Dr. John, minister in Edinburgh, ii. 532, 542, 561
- Eucharistic controversy, 1857-1860, ii. 639-643
- Ewing, Alexander, bishop of Argyll, etc., ii. 627, 637, 645, 658
- Excommunication, mediæval, its formalities and significance, i. 335
- FAIL, in Kyle, monastery of Trinity Friars, i. 392, 467, 468
- Fairfoul, Andrew, archbishop of Glasgow, ii. 340, 341, 354
- Fairley, James, bishop of Argyll, ii. 255, 275
- Falconer, John, college bishop, ii. 459, 490, 492
- Falconer, William, bishop, ii. 510, 529, 530
- Fall, James, principal of Glasgow University, ii. 411, 425
- Fergus, St., i. 167
- Ferne abbey in Ross, i. 355
- Fillan, St., of Loch Tay, i. 35, 162
- Fillan, St., of Strathearn, i. 35, 162, 260
- Finan, bishop of Northumbria, i. 139-141
- Finlay, bishop of Argyll, i. 455
- Forbes, Alexander, lord Pitsligo, ii. 527
- Forbes, Alex. P., bishop of Brechin, ii. 627, 633; his primary charge, 638, 639; trial and censure for erroneous doctrine, 642, 643; his death, character, writings, 660, 661
- Forbes, Dr. John, professor, ii. 247, 248, 279, 284
- Forbes, Duncan, president of Court of Session, ii. 527
- Forbes, John, minister of Alford, ii. 187, 188, 192, 228, 236
- Forbes, Patrick, bishop of Aberdeen, ii. 212, 223, 241
- Forbes, Robert, bishop of Ross, etc., ii. 529
- Forbes, William, bishop of Edinburgh, ii. 227, 239, 240

- Fordun, John of, author of *Scotichronicon*, i. 441
- Foreign Missions of Episcopal Church, ii. 659, 660
- Foreign Missions opposed by General Assembly of 1796, ii. 560, 561; adopted in 1829, 585
- Forman, bishop of Moray, and archbishop of St. Andrews, i. 495, 496, 498; his synodal statutes, 499-503
- Forrest, Henry, Benedictine monk, burned at St. Andrews, i. 506
- Forrester, Robert, layman, burned at Edinburgh, i. 506
- Forret, Thomas, canon of Inchcolm, burned at Edinburgh, i. 506
- Forteviot, council at, i. 186
- Fotadh, bishop of Alban, i. 204, 205, 223, 248, 253
- Franciscans, or Grey Friars, i. 294, 355, 356
- Fraser, William, bishop of St. Andrews, i. 390
- Freebairn, David, bishop of Edinburgh, ii. 496, 510
- Friars, their attitude to the Reformation, i. 505, 506
- Fullarton, John, college bishop, ii. 456, 490, 495
- Fyvie, priory of, i. 466
- GADDERAR, James, bishop of Aberdeen, ii. 459, 490, 492, 495, 499, 509, 510
- Gall, St., the Apostle of Switzerland, i. 117, 122, 123
- Galloway, see of, i. 10-15, 168, 203, 277, 324, 484 *note*, 488
- Gameline, bishop of St. Andrews, i. 384, 385, 389
- Garden, James, professor, King's College, Aberdeen, ii. 425
- Garden, Dr. George, minister at Aberdeen, ii. 448
- Geddes, Jenny, the mythical, ii. 254, 255; the historical, 333
- Geddes, John, R. C. bishop, ii. 558, 559
- Gerard, Andrew, bishop of Aberdeen, ii. 530
- Germanus and Lupus, mission of, to Britain, i. 19, 20
- Gibb, John, of Bo'ness, sectarian, ii. 391
- Gilbert, St., bishop of Caithness, i. 282, 283, 357, 358
- Gillan, John, bishop of Dunblane, ii. 495, 499, 510
- Gillespie, George, minister in Edinburgh, and member of Westminster Assembly, ii. 257, 293, 297, 298
- Gillespie, Patrick, principal of Glasgow University, ii. 318, 320, 323, 327, 334, 337
- Gillespie, Thomas, founder of Relief Church, ii. 524
- Gillis, Father, R. C. bishop, ii. 590, 610, 611
- Gladstones, archbishop of St. Andrews, ii. 205, 206
- Gladstone, Mr. W. E., on Lay Question, ii. 634, 635
- Glamis, lord, chancellor, his six questions to Beza, ii. 110
- Glasgow, missionary station of St. Ninian, i. 12, 13; centre of St. Kentigern's work, 45 *seq.*; his successors, 56; restoration of see by prince David, 261-263; cathedral, 278, 279; later bishops of, 414, 415; University founded, A.D. 1451, by bishop Turnbull, 460; Papal Jubilee, indulgences to citizens, etc., 477; made an archbishopric, 484, 485
- Glass, Rev. John, deposed, founder of Glassites, ii. 500, 501
- Gleig, George, bishop of Brechin, ii. 547, 569-573, 575, 586, 600, 606
- Glencairn, earl of, Reformer, i. 550, 569; ii. 84
- Glencoe massacre, ii. 434, 435
- Glendochart, Celtic foundation, i. 260
- Glenluce abbey in Galloway, i. 340
- Glenorchy, unsuccessful attempt to oust Episcopal clergyman after Revolution, ii. 431
- Gordon, William, bishop of Aberdeen, i. 531
- Gordon, Alexander, bishop of the Isles and of Galloway, and titular archbishop of Athens, i. 532, 533; ii. 43, 101
- Gordon, James, parson of Banchory Devenick, author of the *Reformed Bishop*, ii. 394, 414, 441
- Gordon, James, second R. C. bishop after Reformation, ii. 458, 459
- Gordon, Robert, English non-juring bishop, ii. 537
- Gorham case, ii. 630, 631
- Goudanus, Jesuit, report on Scottish Church and hierarchy in 1562, ii. 37-41
- Gourlay, Norman, burned for heresy, i. 506
- Graham, Patrick, first archbishop of St. Andrews, i. 469, 473-477

- Graham, John, of Claverhouse, viscount Dundee, ii. 386, 399, 409, 412, 415
 Greenshield's case, ii. 463-467
 Gregory, bishop of Moray, i. 259
 Gregory XIII., pope, addresses in 1578, letter "to all Scotsmen," ii. 113
 Gualo, papal legate, his excommunications and extortions, i. 344, 345
 Guthrie, John, bishop of Moray, ii. 238
 Guthrie, Henry, bishop of Dunkeld, ii. 254
 Guthrie, James, minister at Stirling, ii. 323, 327, 334, 336
 HADDINGTON Convent, i. 325
 Haldane, Alex. Chinnery, bishop of Argyll, etc., ii. 674
 Haldanes, Robert and James, their mission in Scotland, ii. 561-564, 566
 Hamilton, John, abbot of Paisley, bishop of Dunkeld, and last Roman archbishop of St. Andrews, i. 497, 498, 512, 523, 533, 534; baptizes prince James at Stirling, ii. 59; capture, execution, character, 81, 82
 Hamilton (archbishop) Catechism, i. 542
 Hamilton, Patrick, burned at St. Andrews, i. 504, 505
 Hamilton, marquis of, ii. 263, 264, 266, 271, 272, 276, 291, 308, 310
 Hamilton, James, bishop of Galloway, ii. 340, 341
 Hamilton, Collegiate Church founded, i. 460
 Hampton Court Conference, ii. 184-186
 Harlaw, battle of, its importance, i. 447, 448
 Harold, bishop of Argyll, i. 341
 Harrison, W. T., bishop of Glasgow, etc., ii. 678
 Harvey, Marion, Covenanter, executed, ii. 390
 Hay, George, R. C. bishop, ii. 538, 539, 558, 559, 573, 574
 Henderson, Alex., minister of Leuchars and then of Edinburgh, ii. 242; 258, 261, 264, 271, 282, 283, 286, 288, 289, 293, 296, 304, 305
 Hepburn, Patrick, bishop of Moray, i. 531, 568
 High Commission, courts of, ii. 195, 196, 246, 354, 355
 Hilda, St., Abbess, i. 128, 135, 143
 Hill, Rowland, English evangelist in Scotland, ii. 562-564
 Hobart, Dr., bishop of New York, visits bishop Jolly, ii. 579
 Holmcultram abbey, i. 287
 Holyrood abbey, canons-regular, i. 285, 286, 438; sacked by English, 530; despoiled by Reformers, 568
 Holyrood, council at, under legate Otho, i. 354
 Holywood abbey, near Dumfries, i. 288; John of Holywood, mathematician, i. 399
 Home, Henry, lord Kames, ii. 525
 Home, John, minister of Athelstaneford, ii. 525-526, 531
 Honeyman, bishop of Orkney, ii. 354, 361
 Hume, David, philosopher and historian, ii. 524, 525
 Huntly, George, earl and first marquis, ii. 148, 152, 158, 160, 161, 174, 195, 200, 213
 Huntly, George, second marquis, ii. 265, 266, 278, 279, 301; execution, 312
 Hutchieson, George, minister at Edinburgh, ii. 362, 368
 INCHAFFRAY abbey, Perthshire, i. 340
 Inchcolm, monastery, founded for canons-regular, i. 259, 481
 Indulgences to Covenanters, ii. 361, 362, 373, 388, 403
 Ingelram, bishop of Glasgow, i. 329, 330, 340
 Innes, Father Thomas, ii. 516
 Innes, George, bishop of Brechin, ii. 530
 Insurrection of 1715, ii. 478-480; of 1745, 515-517
 Interdicts, papal, effects of, i. 335, 336
 Inverness, Dominican monastery, i. 356; cathedral, modern, ii. 666
 Iona, earliest Christianity in, i. 32; government of, and life and constitution of the Columban communities, 84-109; ravaged by Danes, 181, 193, 194; "Arcineach" first appointed, 212; last attack of Danes, 213; title Coarb resumed, and last entry about Iona in the Irish Annals, 219, 220; monastery restored by St. Margaret, 231, 232; visit of king Magnus to, 247, 248; its cathedral, 278, 455
 Ireland, medieval heresies in, i. 427
 Irish missionaries in Alban, i. 110
 Irish missions on the continent, i. 117-125

- Irvine, Sir Alex., of Drum, ii. 328
 Irvine, William, college bishop, ii. 488
 Irving, Edward, Presbyterian minister, Glasgow and London, trial and deposition, ii. 584, 591-594
 Irvingites, the, ii. 594
 Isles, see of, separated from Man, i. 455
 Italian priests in Scottish benefices, i. 366, 394, 395
 Itharnan, St., i. 161
- JAMES, duke of York, age 21, made archbishop of St. Andrews, i. 489
 James V., his illegitimate sons receive church benefices, i. 509; contrasted with James I., 518-520
 James VI., birth and baptism, ii. 59; coronation, 69, 70; schemes of Romanists to capture and convey him abroad, 113; his precocity, 113, 114; marriage, 148, 149; writes *Law of Free Monarchies*, 176; and *Basilikon Doron*, 177; accession to English throne, 181; revisits Scotland, 219-221; king's *Book of Sports*, 221; his letter to Scottish archbishops, 222; death, 229
 James, duke of York, afterwards James VII. of Scotland, ii. 391, 392; accession, 398; restores R. C. worship in Holyrood, 402; despotic treatment of Scottish Church, 403; and of English Church, 405; abdication, 409, 411
 James, prince of Wales, son of James VII., ii. 479, 516
 Jansenism in Scottish Roman Mission, ii. 516
 Jedburgh Parish Church, i. 102; priory and abbey, 285; Observantines, 467
 Jermyn, H. W., bishop of Brechin, and primus, ii. 662, 676
 Jesuits, activity of, in 1579, ii. 117, 118; suppression of their Society in 1773, 539
 Jocelyn, bishop of Glasgow, sent to Rome by William the Lion, i. 336; founder of cathedral, 278, 340
 John, St., of Beverley, i. 144
 John, bishop of Glasgow, i. 262
 John, bishop of St. Andrews and of Dunkeld, i. 334-336, 340, 341
 John of Cheam, bishop of Glasgow, i. 390, 391
 Johnstone, Sir Archibald, of War-riston, ii. 261, 270, 271, 298, 323, 327, 333, 336
- Jolly, Alex., bishop of Moray, ii. 548, 556, 579; death and character, 602-604
 Jubilee, papal, i. 477
- KEILLOR, friar, burned at Edinburgh i. 506
 Keith, Robert, bishop and primus, ii. 489, 494, 495, 499, 510
 Kellach, bishop of the Mercians, i. 139, 200-203, 220
 Kells, Book of, i. 63, 80, 99, 124
 Kelly, J. B. K., bishop of Moray, ii. 676
 Kelso abbey, the Benedictine monks transferred to, from Selkirk, i. 261, 285
 Kennedy, bishop of St. Andrews, i. 457, 458, 462, 463, 469
 Kennedy, Quintin, abbot of Crossraguel, i. 534; his Tractate and controversies, 562-564; debate with Knox at Maybole, ii. 33-35
 Kentigern, St., bishop of the Britons, i. 39-56, 110, 152, 167, 172, 261
 Kessog, or Mackessog, St., i. 113
 Kieran, St., i. 36
 Kilgour, Robert, bishop of Aberdeen, ii. 530, 546, 547
 Kilwinning abbey, i. 288, 422, 438; despoiled, 569
 Kinloss Abbey, i. 286, 325
 Kirkaldy of Grange, i. 527; ii. 64, 76, 79, 83, 99
 "Kirk" and "Church," use of terms, ii. 114 *note*
 Kirkmadrine, in Galloway, its sculptured stones, i. 17
 Kirkton, Covenanting historian, ii. 325
 Knights of St. John and Knights Templar, i. 289
 Knox, John, at Glasgow University, i. 461; first public appearance of, 527; a prisoner, 529; summary of early public life, 546-550; returns to Scotland, 564; preaches in Perth, 565; at Crail, Anstruther, and St. Andrews, 567; condemns robbery of Reforming barons, 569, 570; letter from Knox to queen Elizabeth, 570; his military action, 571; disputes with Romanists, ii. 18, 19; first interview with queen Mary, 23-26; Knox and Maitland of Lethington, their conflicting policies, 27; second interview with queen, 42, 43; third interview, 44; Knox cited before Privy Council, 46, 47:

his second marriage, 49; style of preaching, 54; sermon at coronation of James VI., 70; his illness and removal to St. Andrews, 79, 80; Knox not opposed to principle of Episcopacy, 92; his return to Edinburgh, 93; his last illness, death, and character, 95-98
Knox's Liturgy or Book of Common Order, ii. 11-14

LAITY, co-operation of, in Synods, etc., ii. 579, 580, 634, 635, 663, 664
Lamberton, bishop of St. Andrews, i. 406, 407, 409, 412
Landel, Wm., bishop of St. Andrews, i. 425
Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury, i. 232, 238
Lasswade, St. Mary's Hospital, i. 477
Lateran Council, third, i. 333; fourth, 345, 346, 350, 351
Laud, Dr. Wm., visits Scotland when dean of Gloucester, ii. 219; and again when bishop of London, 236, 277, 287; execution, 304
Lauder, George, bishop of Argyll, i. 463, 464, 471
Lauderdale, duke of (lord Maitland), ii. 290, 298, 334, 353, 363, 364, 367, 372, 373, 376, 379, 381, 397
Laurencekirk, queen Margaret's visit, i. 240, 341
Laurencekirk, conventions at, ii. 551, 554, 555; convocation at, 556; general synod at, in 1828, 586
Law, archbishop of Glasgow, ii. 212, 235
Lawrence, archbishop of Canterbury, i. 127
Lawson, Knox's successor in St. Giles', ii. 93, 138
Laymen's League, ii. 655
Lazarus, St., of Jerusalem, military order, i. 289
Learmont, Thomas, the Rhymer, i. 398
Lee, professor Robert, reforms in presbyterian worship, ii. 646, 650; discussion with dean Ramsay and Dr. Rorison, question of union, 650, 652
Legate for the first time presides over a Scottish Council A.D. 1127, i. 267; different grades of, 328
Leighton, Robert, bishop of Dunblane, and archbishop of Glasgow, ii. 340,

343, 345, 347, 356, 358, 361, 366, 371, 373, 375
Leith, convention of, ratifies Episcopal government, ii. 87-89
Lennox, earl of, regent, ii. 79, 84, 85
Lennox, Esmé Stuart, earl and duke of, ii. 116-119
Leslie, John, bishop of Ross, and historian, ii. 18, 20, 53, 113, 146
note
Leslie, General, ii. 278, 279, 285
Leslie, Sir John, controversy on his appointment to chair of Mathematics in Edinburgh University, ii. 568, 569
Lesmahagow, priory of, i. 285
Lethendy case, ii. 615, 616
Lia Fail or Stool of Destiny, i. 186
Liddon, canon, offered bishoprics of Brechin and Edinburgh, his reasons for refusal, ii. 663, 676, 677
Lights, Old Lights and New Lights, subdivision of Seceders, ii. 567
Lincluden, near Dumfries, Benedictine nunnery, i. 326; made Collegiate Church, 431; ii. 106
Lindores abbey, i. 396, 397; wrecked by Reformers, 567
Lindsay, John, bishop of Glasgow, i. 415
Lindsay, Patrick, bishop of Ross, and archbishop of Glasgow, ii. 235, 256
Lindsay, William, bishop of Brechin and of Edinburgh, ii. 241, 253
Lindsay, Sir David, satire on the clergy, i. 515
Lindsay, David, minister of Leith, and titular bishop of Ross, ii. 136, 148, 180, 189, 210
Linlithgow, Carmelite monastery founded, i. 392; wrecked, 568; provincial council at, in the year 1549, 538; its canons, 539, 540
Lismore (Argyll) cathedral, smallest in Britain, i. 278
Liturgies in Scotland, ii. 216, 249, 250; Laud's, 250, 252; introduction of, 253, 256
Livingstone, abbot of Dundrennan, i. 458; and of Coupar-Angus, 465, 471
note
Livingstone, John, minister, ii. 236, 263
Lockhart of Carnwath, Jacobite, agent of Chevalier, ii. 465, 469, 489, 493, 501
Logie, Gavin, i. 508

- Lollards, the, of Kyle, i. 447, 454, 491, 504
 "Lords of the Congregation," i. 550, 552
 Lord's Prayer, controversy on, i. 543
 Loudon, John, earl of, ii. 261, 287, 289
 Low, David, bishop of Moray, etc., ii. 575; endows see of Argyll, 627; resignation, 632
 Lumsden, Andrew, bishop of Edinburgh, ii. 499, 509
 Luscombe, Dr. Matthew, consecration of, ii. 582, 583, 629
 Lyons, General Council in, A.D. 1274; attended by Scottish bishops, i. 387
- MACBETH, king, i. 210, 221
 M'Crie, Dr. Thomas, historian, ii. 567
 Macdonald, Hugh, R.C. bishop, ii. 515
 Macfarlane, Andrew, bishop of Moray, ii. 548, 556, 575
 M'Gill, Dr., minister of Ayr, charged with heresy, ii. 548, 549
 Machalus, St., i. 36
 Machan, St., i. 36
 Machutus, St., i. 37
 Mackail, Hugh, Presbyterian preacher, executed, ii. 359
 Mackarness, G. R., bishop of Argyll, etc., ii. 659, 674
 Madoes, St., i. 174
 Maelrubha, St., i. 160, 180
 Magnus, St., i. 249-252
 Mahew or Mochta, St., i. 35
 Mair (or Major) John, provost of St. Salvator's College, St. Andrews, favours Reformation, i. 508
 Maitland of Lethington, i. 547; joins Reformers, 571, 572; president of Reforming Parliament in 1560, 575-577; speech in Parliament of 1567, ii. 71; joins the queen's party, 76; death, 98
 Malachy, St., of Armagh, i. 123
 Malbride, bishop of Alban, i. 220
 Malcolm Canmore, king, i. 222-245
 Maldwin, bishop of Alban, i. 222
 Malie, St., i. 117
 Malvoisin, bishop of Glasgow, and of St. Andrews, i. 340, 346, 347, 354, 355
 Manuel, Cistercian nunnery, i. 326
 Maolmuire, bishop of Alban, i. 220
 Map, illustrating Monastic Church, i. 84
 Map, illustrating Mediaeval Church, A.D. 1200-1560, i. 344
- Mar, earl of, regent, ii. 85
 Mar, earl of, leader of Insurrection of 1715, ii. 478, 479
 Margaret, St., queen, i. 225-245; her conference with Celtic clergy, 234-239; enshrining of her relics, 382
 Margaret, maiden of Norway, i. 402, 403
 Margaret of Denmark, wife of James III., request for her canonisation, i. 470, 480
 Marianus Scotus, i. 218, 253
 Marischal, earl, speech in reforming Parliament of 1560, i. 578, 579
 Marnock, St., i. 111
 Marnock case, ii. 616-619
 Marriage of clergy, i. 216
 Marrow controversy, ii. 486, 487
 Mary of Lorraine, regent, i. 545-574
 Mary, queen of Scotland, sent to France, i. 530; marriage of, with Dauphin, 554; returns to Scotland, ii. 21, 22; opposition to celebration of Mass in Holyrood, 23; interviews with Knox, 24-26, 42-45; public entrance into Edinburgh, 27, 28; opens her first Parliament, 44; marriage with Darnley, 51; suspected of having joined foreign league against Protestants, 55, 56; birth and baptism of prince James, 59; murder of Darnley, 62; queen's marriage with Bothwell and imprisonment in Lochleven, 64; deposition, 67; escape from Lochleven, battle of Langside and queen's flight into England, 74; plot against her, 77; trial and execution, 142-145
 Mary, queen of England, effect of her death on Scottish Church, i. 554, 555
 Maurice, bishop of Dunblane, i. 413
 Maxwell, John, minister in Edinburgh, and bishop of Ross, ii. 235, 251, 277, 282
 Mediaeval Church, its decadence, i. 560, 561; causes of its fall, 580, 582
 Melrose, Anglican foundation at Old Mailross, i. 142, 152; abbey, Cistercian, 286, 287
 Melville, Andrew, early career, ii. 103; opposes regent Morton, 105; attacks Episcopacy, 106, 107; letter to Beza, 111; moderator of Assembly, 114; before king James at Perth, 127; flight to Berwick, 132; controversy with archbishop Adamson, 136, 137; speeches at Falkland, 162, 164, and at Hampton

- Court, 190, 191; exile and death in Sedan, 191, 192, 228
- Melville, James, author of *Diary*, ii. 150, 161, 192, 228
- "Mensal" churches, i. 395, 517
- Middleton, John, earl of, ii. 334, 350, 352
- Millar, Arthur, bishop of Edinburgh, ii. 488, 495, 496, 499
- Millenary petition, ii. 183
- Milne, abbot of Cambuskenneth and first president of Court of Session, i. 510
- Ministers, Protestant, keeping ale-houses, ii. 109
- Mirren, St., of Paisley, i. 114, 115
- Mitchell, David, bishop of Aberdeen, ii. 346, 347, 349, 352
- Mitchell, James, attempts assassination of archbishop Sharp, ii. 361; his trial and execution, 380, 381
- Modan, SS., i. 115
- Moderators of Assembly first appointed in 1563, ii. 17
- Modoc, St., i. 117
- Modwenna, or Monenna, St., i. 36
- Moir, David, bishop of Brechin, ii. 602
- Molio, or Malaissi, St., i. 115
- Moluoc, or Maluog, St., i. 111
- Monan, St., i. 37, 190
- Monasteries, the early, i. 9, 10; those founded in reign of king David I., i. 285, 302
- Monasticism, mediæval, i. 290; work and influence for good, 295, 301; some evil effects of, 301, 302
- Monro, Alexander, principal of Edinburgh University, ii. 425
- Montgomery, Robert, tulchan archbishop of Glasgow, ii. 125-127
- Montrose, earl and first marquis, ii. 258, 261, 278, 285, 287, 301, 302, 313-315
- Monymusk, seat of Culdees and cell of St. Andrews, i. 315, 317
- Moravia, Andrew de, bishop of Moray, i. 358
- Moray, foundation of see, i. 259, 260
- Moray, regent, i. 509, 538; ii. 21, 26, 28, 29, 48, 67, 70, 71; his assassination and character, 77, 78
- Morrison, Dr. James, minister at Kilmarnock, deposed by Seceders and founds "Evangelical Union Church," ii. 612
- Mortlach, supposititious episcopal see at, i. 219; monastery at, 224
- Morton, earl of, regent, ii. 100; proposals as to ministers' stipends, 103-105; resigns regency, 112; execution, 117
- Munna, or Mundas, St., Kilmun on the Clyde, i. 110
- Mylne, Walter, vicar of Lunnan, the last to be burned in Scotland for heresy by Roman hierarchy, i. 553
- NATHALAN, St., or Nechtan, i. 116, 117
- Nechtan, king, i. 168, 173, 174
- New Light Burghers and Anti-Burghers unite, ii. 625, 626
- Nicolson, Thomas, first R.C. bishop in Scotland since Reformation, ii. 442
- Ninian, St., 6-17
- Non-jurants, Presbyterians, ii. 472, 474
- Non-jurors, Jacobites, ii. 413, 421, 423, 453
- Norrie, Robert, college bishop, ii. 493, 495
- Northampton, Council of, i. 331, 332; treaty of independence of Scottish Church, 417
- OBSERVANTINES, reformed Franciscans, i. 467, 509
- Ochterlonie, John, college bishop, ii. 493, 499, 511
- Ogilvie, the Jesuit, trial and execution of, in Glasgow, ii. 211, 212
- Old Light Anti-Burghers join Free Church in 1852, ii. 626
- Ordinal (Charles I.), ii. 243, 244
- Orkney and Shetland islands acquired as queen Margaret's dowry, i. 470
- Orkney, see of, i. 275; cathedral at Kirkwall (St. Magnus's), 278
- Orphir, Orkney, circular church, i. 251
- Oswald, St., king, i. 128, 129, 136
- Oswin, king, i. 137-139
- Ottoboni, cardinal legate, afterwards Pope Adrian V., visits Scotland, i. 386
- Oxford movement 1833, effect of, on Scottish Episcopal Church, ii. 600
- PAISLEY priory and abbey, i. 326, 327, 465, 498; despoiled by lord Glencairn, reformer, 569
- Palladius, St., mission of, i. 3, 19-23
- Palmer, Wm., his negotiations with Eastern Church, ii. 628-630
- Pan-Anglican Conferences, 1867, 1878, 1888, ii. 655-657
- Panter, David, bishop of Ross, i. 535
- Papal legates and councils, i. 267, 268; excommunication and interdict, 335, 336, 411; dispensations,

- 415, 421-424; exercise of church patronage, 465, 466; letters during reign of Alexander II., 360-368; letters during reign of James II., 464-468; jubilees, 477
- Papal schisms, i. 436, 437, 448, 449
- Papal "aggression" in England, 1850, ii. 633
- Papal hierarchy restored in Scotland, ii. 668, 669; action of the Scottish bishops thereanent, 669, 670
- Parishes and dioceses, i. 102, 182
- Parliament of August 1560 abolishes papal jurisdiction and inaugurates the Reformation, i. 574-580
- 1567, confirms the Confession of Faith and the abolition of popery, ii. 71; makes provision of the thirds of the old benefices for stipends, 72
- May 1584 curtails power of Assembly and confirms principle of Episcopacy, 134, 135
- August 1584 enforces subscription to the Acts, 136
- June 1592 establishes Presbyterian religion, 154
- 1621 ratifies Five Articles of Perth, 226
- 1637 extends royal prerogative and confirms the Episcopal polity, 237
- 1661 passes Rescissory Act, 334
- 1662 confirms Episcopal Government, 348
- 1669 passes Assertory Act, 363, 364
- 1681 passes Test and Succession Acts, 392
- 1689 disestablishes Episcopacy, 412
- 1690 establishes Presbyterianism, 415, 416
- 1703 last of Scottish Parliaments, 454
- Paterson, John, bishop of Galloway and of Edinburgh, and archbishop of Glasgow, ii. 393, 403, 420, 459
- Patrick, St., i. 26-33
- Patronage, ii. 291, 292, 348, 349; history of, 470; Act of 1712, 471, 472, 502, 503, 523, 524, 533-536, 595, 650
- Payne, Neville, torture of, ii. 437
- Pelagian controversy, i. 18-20
- Penal laws against Episcopalians, ii. 480, 481, 517-520; repeal of, 551-553
- Persecuting oath at coronation, i. 420
- Persecution of Protestants, i. 447, 454, 491, 506-509, 514, 526, 527, 544, 553
- Persecution of Romanists, ii. 17, 28, 43, 44, 47, 48, 71, 101, 158-160, 195, 200, 210-212, 224-225, 329, 330, 407, 437, 438, 497, 520, 538-542, 558
- Persecution of Episcopalians, ii. 257, 259, 265, 267, 269, 270, 274, 277, 279, 281, 284, 285, 293, 300, 302, 303, 312, 319, 327, 328, 407, 435, 436, 453, 480, 481, 517-520
- Persecution of Covenanters, ii. 336, 337, 351, 353, 355, 359, 371-373, 379, 381-382, 396, 404; Review of persecutions of Covenanters, 404, 405
- Persecution of Quakers, ii. 393, 394, 437, 438
- Persecution of witches, ii. 49, 76, 282-283 *note*, 401, 444, 445 *note*
- Perth, provincial councils at, i. 338, 339, 354, 387, 389, 413, 449, 452, 458; Dominican monastery, 356, 455; Carthusian monastery, 290, 455; executions for heresy A.D. 1542, 526; destruction of monasteries, 565; General Assembly at, in 1618, passes the Five Articles, ii. 223, 224; St. Ninian's Cathedral, modern, ii. 632, 633, 666
- "Peter's Pence," i. 426
- Petrie, Arthur, bishop of Moray, etc., ii. 530, 546-548
- Philiphaugh, defeat of Montrose and execution of prisoners, ii. 302, 303
- Picts and Scots form one kingdom A.D. 843, i. 184
- Picts, Galloway, the last of the name, i. 267
- Pinkie Cleuch, battle of, i. 529
- Pisa, Council of, i. 449
- Plurality of Offices in Presbyterian Church, ii. 584, 585
- Pluscardine priory founded, i. 355; proposal to unite priories of Pluscardine and Urquhart, 466
- Pont, Robert, minister of St. Cuthbert's, Edinburgh, titular bishop of Caithness, ii. 149
- Popes and Anti-popes, i. 436
- Prayer-Book, English, used in Scotland on the eve of Reformation and afterwards, i. 550-552
- Premonstratenses, monastic order, i. 291-292
- Presbyteries first appointed, ii. 120, 121
- Presbyterian Establishment of the Revolution, ii. 412-416; low ebb

of religion in 1800, 565, 566; and of worship in 1850, 647
 Presbyterian Churches, recent theological changes and charges of heresy, ii. 670-674
 Procurations, i. 396, 397
 "Protesters" and "Resolutioners," ii. 283, 320, 325, 326, 334
 Provincial councils under a conservator, i. 351-355
 Provincial canons and synodal statutes of the thirteenth century, i. 368-380
 Provincial statutes of 1549, i. 539, 540
 Provincial statutes of 1552, i. 540-544
 Provincial council of 1559, i. 555-560
 Puritans in Scotland, ii. 328, 329

 QUAKERS. See under Persecutions
 "Qualified" ministers and chapels, ii. 482, 555, 557, 609, 610
 Queensferry Declaration, ii. 389

 RABBLING of Episcopal clergy in the west, ii. 407
 Rabbling Act of 1698, ii. 446
 Rait, James, bishop of Brechin, ii. 511
 Ramsay, James, dean of Glasgow and bishop of Dunblane, ii. 369, 375-378
 Ramsay, E. B., dean of Edinburgh, ii. 605, 628, 643
 Ranken, David, college bishop, ii. 495
 Rattray, Thomas, bishop of Brechin, and later of Dunkeld, ii. 493, 495, 510-511
 Reader, office of, ii. 7; abolished, 121
 "Reconciliation" of a church after its profanation, i. 445 and *note*
 Reformation operative, i. 504-525; Reformations in England and Scotland contrasted, ii. 2, 3; character of reformed Church of 1560, Protestant, but neither Episcopal nor Presbyterian, ii. 14, 15
 Regium Donum grant from Government, ii. 574
 Regulus, St., Tower of, at St. Andrews, i. 179
 Reid, Robert, bishop of Orkney, second president of Court of Session, i. 535-538

Reid, Dr. Thomas, professor and author, ii. 533
 Relief Church, ii. 524, 534
 Renwick, James, Covenanter, ii. 396, 404
 Representative Church Council formed in 1876, ii. 665, 666
 Resby, John, English priest, Wickliffite, first to be burned in Scotland for heresy, i. 447
 Rescissory Act of 1661, ii. 334, 337
 Resolutioners and Protestors, ii. 283, 320, 327, 332, 347
 Richard, bishop of St. Andrews, i. 329, 428
 Rizzio, David, his murder in Holyrood, ii. 57, 58
 Robert, bishop of St. Andrews, i. 258, 268-270, 324
 Robertson, William, principal of Edinburgh University, ii. 531, 532, 536, 537, 540, 543, 551
 Rollock, Robert, first principal of Edinburgh University, ii. 173
 Roman Catholics, persecution of. See under Persecutions
 Roman Catholics, Scottish, numbers of, in 1681, ii. 443; in 1800, 559; in 1829, 589
 Roman Catholic Emancipation Act in 1829, ii. 588, 589
 Roman Church, no supremacy over Celtic, i. 106
 Rorison, Rev. Dr., on union of Episcopacy with Established Presbyterianism, ii. 651, 652
 Rose, Alex., bishop of Moray and of Edinburgh, ii. 403, 406, 408-410, 420, 489
 Rose, Charles, bishop of Dunblane, etc., ii. 530, 547, 550, 555
 Rose, James, college bishop, ii. 493, 499, 509
 Ross, Arthur, bishop of Galloway, archbishop of Glasgow and of St. Andrews, ii. 388, 397, 420, 455
 Ross, see of, founded, i. 271; its cathedral, 278
 Rothes, John, earl of, "the father of the Covenant," ii. 272, 287
 Rothes, earl and duke of, ii. 352, 353, 360, 379, 397
 Row, John, joins Reformers, i. 572
 Roxburgh, council at, A.D. 1126, the first held under legate authority in Scotland, i. 267; Franciscan monastery, 356
 Rule, St., chapel and tower of, in St.

- Andrews, built by bishop Robert, i. 269
- Rullion Green, Covenanters defeated, ii. 359
- Rutherford, Samuel, minister of Anwoth and Principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, ii. 246, 247, 282, 297, 320, 323, 336, 337
- Ruthven, Raid of, ii. 128, 131
- Russell, Jerome, burned, i. 507
- Russell, Michael, bishop of Glasgow, ii. 575, 602, 628
- Rutherglen, Covenanters' Declaration at, ii. 385
- Rye House Plot, ii. 395
- SAGE, John, college bishop, ii. 423, 424, 456
- St. Andrews, early legends of, i. 175-179; supremacy of, 200; its bishops — bishops of Alban and bishops of the Scots, 220, 256-258, 260, 262; foundation of cathedral, 276; consecration of, 276, 409, 327; disputed election to see of, 337; synodal statutes of, 379-380, 442-445; university founded by bishop Wardlaw, 448; St. Savior's College founded by bishop Kennedy, 461; made an archbishopric, 473-476; provincial council, 523; convention at, 522; cathedral and monasteries wrecked, 567; St. Andrews furnishes the leading clerical reformers, 572
- Sandale or Saddell, Cistercian abbey in Cantyre, i. 326
- Sandford, Daniel, bishop of Edinburgh, etc., ii. 557, 558, 575, 581, 587
- Sandilands, Sir James, despatched to queen Mary in France, ii. 19, 20
- "Sang Scuils," proposals to rehabilitate, ii. 115, 116, 461
- Sanquhar Declaration, ii. 389
- Sardica, council at, i. 5
- Sarum Use in Scottish Church, i. 281
- Scandinavians, paganism of, i. 213
- Scheves, archbishop of St. Andrews, i. 476, 477, 479, 480, 484, 489
- Scone, the "Royal" city, i. 193; first Church council at Moote-hill near, 200; Malcolm III., first Scottish "coronation," 224; Monastery for canons-regular founded, 258; Charter of, 260; Edward I. carries off coronation stone and ransacks abbey, 405; Robert Bruce crowned at, 407; provincial council at (1325), 414; abbey and palace wrecked and ruined by Reformers, 568
- "Scotia," name first applied to N.B., i. 214, 218
- Scotic and Pictish Kingdoms, union of, i. 183
- Scotland under papal interdicts, i. 335, 336, 344, 345
- Scots College, Paris, i. 413; ii. 558, 559, 610, 611
- Scots first from Ireland, i. 3
- Scott, Michael, the wizard, baron of Balwirie, i. 398
- Scottish abbeys *in commendam*, i. 497
- "Scottish Church," title first applied, i. 191-193; decadence of, 211, 233; claims of supremacy by see of York, 241; first connection with Rome through legates, 305-306; the special daughter of Rome, 337, 348; sees usurped by the pope, 429
- Scottish Office, ii. 514, 531, 546, 570, 573
- Scotus, John Duns, i. 399
- Scougal, Patrick, bishop of Aberdeen, ii. 354, 393-395
- Seabury, Dr. Samuel, consecration, ii. 544, 577; centenary celebration, 675, 676
- Secession Church founded in 1733, ii. 506
- Sedulius, bishop of the Britons, i. 56, 167, 261
- Selkirk, settlement of Benedictine monks, i. 261
- Serf, or Servanus, St., i. 24, 43, 164-167
- Sharp, James, minister of Crail, and archbishop of St. Andrews, ii. 321, 326, 327, 331-333, 340-343, 345, 346, 349, 354, 361-363, 376-379, 380-384
- Sheriffmuir, battle of, ii. 478
- Sigillo, Hugh de, bishop of Dunkeld, i. 341
- Sigurd, earl, i. 206, 215, 221, 249
- Simeon, a priest, burned, i. 506
- Simeon of Durham, i. 217
- Simson, John, professor of divinity in Glasgow, prosecuted for heresies, ii. 485
- Sinclair, Henry, bishop of Ross, ii. 54
- Sinclair, John, dean of Restalrig, bishop of Brechin, and president of Court of Session, ii. 17, 51, 53

- Skinner, John, bishop of Aberdeen, ii. 530, 546, 547, 551, 574, 575
 Skinner, John, dean of Dunkeld, author of *Annals*, ii. 571, 579, 580
 Skinner, John, of Longside, historian, ii. 518, 520
 Skinner, William, bishop of Aberdeen, ii. 575, 607, 637
 Smeaton, Thomas, principal of Glasgow University, ii. 139
 Sodor and Man added to Scottish sees, i. 383
 Soltra, hospital founded, i. 326
 Souleseat abbey in Galloway, i. 287, 288
 Spanish Armada, ii. 147
 "Spanish Blanks," ii. 158
 Spence, Thomas, bishop of Aberdeen, i. 471, 475, 480
 Spottiswoode, archbishop of Glasgow and St. Andrews, and historian, ii. 198, 201, 202, 212, 215, 229, 242, 255, 267, 282
 Spottiswoode, John, superintendent, i. 461
 Spottiswoode, Sir Robert, his execution as a Royalist, ii. 302, 303
 Stephen, William, professor in St. Andrews, and bishop of Dunblane, i. 449
 Stewart, Alexander, age 16, archbishop of St. Andrews, i. 489, 490
 Stewart, Alexander, "the Wolf of Badenoch," his sacrilege, i. 437, 438
 Stewart, Andrew, bishop of Caithness, i. 496, 497
 Stipends of Protestant ministers after Reformation, ii. 28-30, 72, 73
 Stirling, Dominican monastery founded, i. 356; wrecked, 568
 Strachan, John, bishop of Brechin, ii. 548, 551, 569
 Straton, David, burned, i. 506
 Superintendents, highest grade of Protestant ministry, i. 574; ii. 7, 8, 9, 14, 17 *note*
 Surplice, use of, recommended in General Synod of 1811, ii. 573
 Suther, Thos. G., bishop of Aberdeen, ii. 636, 638, 674
 Sweetheart or New Abbey, latest in Scotland, i. 391, 392; ii. 210
 Sydserf, bishop of Brechin, of Galloway, and of Orkney, ii. 241, 257, 277, 339, 354
 Sylvius, Æneas, afterwards pope Pius II., visits Scotland, i. 453, 454
 Synodal Statutes, archbishop Forman's, i. 499-503
 Synod, General, in 1811, the first since Revolution, ii. 572, 573; in 1828, 586; in 1829, 586, 587; in 1838, 604, 605; in 1862-1863, 644-645; in 1876, 664, 665; in 1890, 678-680
 "TABLES, the," Covenanting, ii. 258, 259
 Tarbet, R. C. priest maltreated for celebrating mass, Easter 1565, ii. 47, 48
 Ternan, St., of the Mearns, i. 23-25
 Terrot, Charles H., bishop of Edinburgh, ii. 607, 638, 643, 644
 Test and Succession Acts, ii. 392, 393
 Thomson, Dr. Andrew, minister of St. George's, Edinburgh, ii. 584
 Thurstan, archbishop of York, i. 262
 Tironenses, Benedictine order, i. 292
 Toleration Act of 1712, ii. 467-469
 Tomans, St., i. 114
 Tonsures, different, i. 97
 Torry, Patrick, bishop of St. Andrews, etc., ii. 569; his prayer-book, 631, 632
 Towers, round: Abernethy, Brechin, and Egilsay, i. 188, 189, 251
 Transubstantiation first decreed at Lateran Council A.D. 1215, i. 345
 Traquair, the lord treasurer, ii. 257, 259
 Trent, Council of, i. 523; ii. 36, 37, 51, 52
 Trinitarians or Red Friars, i. 292, 339, 392
 Trinity College, Glenalmond, ii. 608, 609
 Trower, Walter John, bishop of Glasgow, ii. 628, 641, 642
 Trumhere, bishop of Mercia, i. 139
 Trumwin, bishop of the Angles, i. 156
 Tuathal, bishop of Fortrenn, i. 187
 Tulchan bishops, difference between them and titular bishops, ii. 126
 Tullilum, near Perth, Carmelite monastery, i. 392
 Tungland abbey in Galloway, i. 288
 Turgot, bishop of St. Andrews, i. 223, 226, 248, 249, 253-255, 259, 260
 Turnbull, William, bishop of Glasgow, and founder of its university, i. 460
 Tuthald, bishop of Alban, i. 223
 Tynemouth priory, i. 138

- UNION, Act of, between Scotland and England, ii. 457, 458
 Union proposed between Episcopal and Established Churches, ii. 650, 651; between Free and U. P. Churches, ii. 652, 653; between the Established and Free Churches, 654, 655
 United Presbyterian Church formed, ii. 625-626
 United Secession Church formed, ii. 567
 Urquhart priory, i. 286
 "Usages," the, ii. 490-492

 VALLIS Cautilum, order of reformed Cistercians, i. 290, 293
 Verulam, conference at, i. 20
 Veto Act of 1834, ii. 596-597
 Vigean, St., i. 116
 Voluntaryism, first note of, ii. 549

 WALKER, James, bishop of Edinburgh, ii. 572, 581, 582, 587, 588, 600, 606, 607
 Wallace, Adam, burned at Castlehill, Edinburgh, i. 544
 Wallace, John, Roman Catholic bishop ii. 496, 497
 Walter, bishop of Glasgow, commission of inquiry into conduct, i. 348-350
 Waltheof, abbot of Melrose, bishop-elect of St. Andrews, i. 324, 325
 Wardlaw, Henry, bishop of St. Andrews and first Scottish cardinal, i. 436, 450, 457
 Wardlaw, Ralph, leader of Independents, ii. 566, 594
 Wardlaw, Walter, bishop of Glasgow, i. 421, 440
 Watson, Jonathan, bishop of Dunkeld, ii. 555, 569
 Wedderburn, James, bishop of Dunblane, ii. 242, 251, 282
 Weddings, Penny, ii. 461
 Welch, John, minister at Ayr, son-in-law of John Knox, ii. 167, 188, 192, 228
 Wesley, John, in Scotland, ii. 522, 523
 Westminster Assembly, ii. 292, 295; the six Scottish representatives present at its meetings, 296-298, 306, 307
 Whiggamores' raid, ii. 308

 Whitby, conference at, A.D. 664, i. 143-149
 White, Robert, bishop of Dunblane, ii. 510, 529
 Whitfield, George, visits Scottish Seceders, ii. 507, 508; returns to Scotland, 508-509
 Whithorn, i. 10-14
 Wigton women, martyrs, ii. 399, 400
 Wilfrid, St., archbishop, i. 135, 142, 143, 155
 Wilkinson, Dr., formerly bishop of Truro, elected bishop of St. Andrews, etc., ii. 682
 William III. prince of Orange, ii. 406, 410-413, 427, 432, 433, 449, 450
 Willock, John, superintendent of Glasgow, and first moderator of General Assembly in 1563, ii. 17
 Wilson, W. S., dean and bishop of Glasgow, etc., ii. 642, 678
 Wimund, impostor, and bishop of Sodor and Man, i. 266
 Winram, John, sub-prior of St. Andrews, i. 508; assists in compilation of archbishop Hamilton's catechism, 542; joins Reformers, 572; superintendent of Fife, 574; assists in framing first Confession of Faith, 577; ii. 4
 Winzet, Ninian, priest and school-master at Linlithgow, i. 534; his controversies with Protestants, ii. 32, 33
 Wishart, Dr. George, minister in St. Andrews and bishop of Edinburgh, ii. 279, 346, 349, 360
 Wishart, George, burned at St. Andrews, i. 526-528
 Wishart, Robert, bishop of Glasgow, i. 406, 407, 409, 413, 422
 Wishart, William, bishop of St. Andrews, i. 389, 390, 406-413
 Witches. See under Persecution of
 Wodrow, Robert, historian, ii. 501, 502
 Wordsworth, Charles, bishop of St. Andrews, etc., ii. 636; his work, writings, and influence in favour of ecclesiastical union, 680-682
 Wynnin, St., i. 37

 YORK, see of, claims supremacy over Scottish Church, i. 241, 255, 262; protest against supremacy of, 332, 333

ERRATA—VOL. I

- Page 274, l. 8. The old cathedral of Dornoch is not entirely ruinous, part of it being now used for the parish church.
- Page 349, ll. 12, 13, *read* he permits certain members of his household to keep the wives, etc.
- Page 361, ll. 6, 7, and 20, and p. 377, l. 5, *for* soldiers *read* knights.
- Page 369, l. 19, *for* parishioners *read* parsons; l. 26, *for* dismissory *read* commendatory.
- Page 373, l. 21, *read* besmearing the ears and nostrils with spittle.
- Page 375, l. 8, *for* choruses, etc., *read* wrestlings and games.
- „ l. 17, *read* the fabric of the Cathedral Church.
- „ ll. 19, 20, *read* songs and dances.
- „ ll. 21, 22, *read* wrestling matches nor games.
- Page 376, l. 22, *read* the third part of the third.
- Page 410, l. 25 and note 2, *for* bishop of Carlisle *read* bishop of Corbavia (in Dalmatia).
- Page 471, ll. 18, 19, *read* the union of the hospital at Soultra with Trinity Collegiate Church, Edinburgh.
- Page 528, As to the complicity of George Wishart in the murder of Cardinal Beaton, the author, upon further evidence (see *e.g.* Mr. Melville's *Old Dundee*, p. 88), would so far modify his opinion as to withdraw the verdict of guilty and substitute not proven.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS ON THE FIRST VOLUME

From the "Scotsman."

"Mr. Stephen's work deserves a large measure of trust as well as of praise for its literary qualities. It is a lucid, compact, and masterly *resumé* of the growth, character, and fortunes of the Celtic and Mediæval Church in Scotland."

From the "Glasgow Herald."

"Virile and patriotic in tone . . . his narrative is always readable, and well based on documentary evidence. One may not always be able to agree with Mr. Stephen's reading of *Scottish Church History*, but there is so much that is excellent and admirable in this instalment, that we shall look forward with interest to the second volume."

From the "North British Daily Mail."

"A work which is interesting and valuable for its historical matter, and for its clear and vigorous style. . . . All will accord the writer praise for the ability and labour which are shown in his volume."

From the "Scottish Leader."

"Much less one-sided than the popular histories have commonly been; and the summary of the causes of the fall of the Romish Church is judicial and convincing. If the second and concluding volume is equally weighty in its treatment of Presbyterian history, it may supply a wholesome criticism."

From the "Dundee Advertiser."

"The writer has the rare faculty of selecting the best authorities on disputed points. . . . It must be admitted by every candid critic that Mr. Stephen is well fitted for this task. . . . The volume is really an excellent piece of historical work."

From the "Arbroath Guide."

"Mr. Stephen's is an excellent history—learned, without being 'heavy.' The book is written in an easy and vigorous style, and it has the great merit of popularly opening up much that is not well known in the early history of the Scottish Church."

From the "Aberdeen Daily Free Press."

"We must heartily thank the author for doing what is really an excellent piece of work. It is a great satisfaction and a real boon to have within moderate compass so full and clear and reliable an account of the vast literature of early Scottish Church history."

From the "Scottish Guardian."

"Mr. Stephen's first volume places within the reach of the ordinary reader stores of valuable information which are not to be found in any one work of any previous writer. He has produced a *History* which is clear, compact, accurate, and eminently readable."

From the "Scottish Standard-Bearer."

"The first volume gives abundant evidence that Mr. Stephen is no unworthy follower of his great predecessor in the field of Scottish ecclesiastical history, Dr. Grub; and that his will be the standard History in the future, as Grub's has been in the past. No educated Church layman can consider his library complete without a copy of this masterly and deeply-interesting work."

From the "Church Times."

"It is the work of a priest and a patriot, at once liberal and Catholic, free alike from the Protestant and the Vaticanist bias, but able to do justice to all that was righteous in the two rival parties which tore the Church of Scotland to pieces. No one can read his pages without learning much that is quite unknown to the ordinary English student. His most difficult and delicate work, it must be owned, has yet to be done, and we think that he has given signs in this volume that no living scholar is more capable for the task."

From the "Scottish Antiquary."

"We feel sure the reader will lay it down when finished with a wish to see the continuation of the work, which will include a period which, we doubt not, Mr. Stephen will treat in as scholarly a style, and in as fair a spirit as he has already displayed."


**From Canon Bellesheim (Author of the "Catholic Church in Scotland")
in the "Literarischer Handweiser" (translation).**

"This new work . . . betokens in comparison with earlier efforts on the part of Scottish Protestants a notable advance, and merits hearty commendation."

**ARCHITECTURAL
ARCHÆOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL WORKS**

RECENTLY PUBLISHED

By DAVID DOUGLAS



*Five Volumes Royal 8vo, 42s. net each volume, with about
500 Illustrations in each volume.*

THE
CASTELLATED AND DOMESTIC
ARCHITECTURE
OF SCOTLAND

FROM THE TWELFTH TO THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

BY
DAVID MACGIBBON AND THOMAS ROSS
ARCHITECTS



"One of the most important and complete books on Scottish architecture that has ever been compiled. Its value to the architect, the archæologist, and the student of styles is at once apparent. It consists almost exclusively of what may be called illustrated architectural facts, well digested and arranged, and constituting a monument of patient research, capable draughtsmanship, and of well-sustained effort, which do the authors infinite credit."—*Scoteman*.

EDINBURGH: DAVID DOUGLAS

*Volume I. now ready. Royal 8vo, 42s. net. Vols. II. and III.
in preparation.*


THE
ECCLESIASTICAL
ARCHITECTURE
OF SCOTLAND

FROM THE EARLIEST CHRISTIAN TIMES TO THE
SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

BY

DAVID MACGIBBON AND THOMAS ROSS

AUTHORS OF "THE CASTELLATED AND DOMESTIC ARCHITECTURE OF SCOTLAND"



IN THREE VOLUMES

EDINBURGH: DAVID DOUGLAS

One Volume 8vo, 21s., with nearly 300 Illustrations.

THE ARCHITECTURE OF PROVENCE


AND

THE RIVIERA

BY

DAVID MACGIBBON

AUTHOR OF "THE CASTELLATED AND DOMESTIC ARCHITECTURE OF SCOTLAND"



EDINBURGH: DAVID DOUGLAS

Two Volumes 8vo, fully Illustrated, 12s. each (sold separately).

SCOTLAND


IN

EARLY CHRISTIAN TIMES

THE RHIND LECTURES IN ARCHÆOLOGY—1879 AND 1880.

BY JOSEPH ANDERSON, LL.D.

KEEPER OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF THE ANTIQUARIES OF SCOTLAND



CONTENTS OF VOL. I.—Celtic Churches—Monasteries—Hermitages—Round Towers—Illuminated Manuscripts—Bells—Crosiers—Reliquaries, etc.

CONTENTS OF VOL. II.—Celtic Metal-Work and Sculptured Monuments, their Art and Symbolism—Inscribed Monuments in Runics and Oghams—Bilingual Inscriptions, etc.

EDINBURGH: DAVID DOUGLAS

Two Volumes 8vo, fully Illustrated, 12s. each (sold separately).

SCOTLAND IN PAGAN TIMES

The Iron Age

THE RHIND LECTURES IN ARCHÆOLOGY FOR 1881

The Bronze and Stone Ages

THE RHIND LECTURES IN ARCHÆOLOGY FOR 1882

BY JOSEPH ANDERSON, LL.D.

KEEPER OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF THE ANTIQUARIES OF SCOTLAND



CONTENTS OF VOL. I.—*The Iron Age*.—Viking Burials and Hoards of Silver and Ornaments—Arms, Dress, etc., of the Viking Time—Celtic Art of the Pagan Period—Decorated Mirrors—Enamelled Armlets—Architecture and Contents of the Brochs—Lake-Dwellings—Earth Houses, etc.

CONTENTS OF VOL. II.—*The Bronze and Stone Ages*.—Cairn Burial of the Bronze Age and Cremation Cemeteries—Urns of Bronze Age Types—Stone Circles—Stone Settings—Gold Ornaments—Implements and Weapons of Bronze—Cairn Burial of the Stone Age—Chambered Cairns—Urns of Stone Age Types—Implements and Weapons of Stone.

EDINBURGH: DAVID DOUGLAS

One Volume 8vo, fully Illustrated, 15s.

THE
PAST IN THE PRESENT:
WHAT IS CIVILISATION?

BY SIR ARTHUR MITCHELL, M.D., LL.D.



CONTENTS.

- | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| I. The Spindle and Whorl. | IV. Cave Life. |
| II. Craggans and Querns, etc. | V. Stone, Bronze, and Iron Ages. |
| III. Beehive Houses, etc. | VI. Superstitions. |

EDINBURGH: DAVID DOUGLAS

W. Stephen.

History of the Scottish Church. By W. STEPHEN, Rector
of St Augustine's, Dumbarton. 2 vols. demy 8vo, 25s.

Robert Milne.

**The Blackfriars of Perth. The Chartulary and Papers of
their House.** Edited, with Introduction, by ROBERT MILNE, D.D., West Kirk,
Perth. Demy 4to, 21s.

James Watson.

**Jedburgh Abbey: Historical and Descriptive; also the
Abbeys of Teviotdale, as showing the Development of Gothic Architecture.**
By JAMES WATSON. Second Edition. Sm. 4to, Illustrated, 10s. net.

Earl of Southesk.

**Origins of Pictish Symbolism. With Notes on the Sun
Boar, and a New Reading of the Newton "Inscriptions."** By the EARL OF
SOUTHESK. Sm. 4to, 9s.

David MacRitchie.

Scottish Gypsies under the Stewarts. By DAVID MACRITCHIE.
Demy 8vo, 6s. net.

Prof. Baldwin Brown.

**From Schola to Cathedral. A Study of Early Christian
Architecture in its relation to the life of the Church.** By G. BALDWIN BROWN,
Professor of Fine Art in the University of Edinburgh. Demy 8vo, Illustrated,
7s. 6d.

The book treats of the beginnings of Christian Architecture, from the point
of view of recent discoveries and theories, with a special reference to the out-
ward resemblance of early Christian communities to other religious associations
of the time.

EDINBURGH: DAVID DOUGLAS.

William F. Skene.

Celtic Scotland. A History of Ancient Alban. By WILLIAM F. SKENE, D.C.L., LL.D., Historiographer-Royal for Scotland. Second Edition, carefully Revised by the Author, with a new Index to the entire work. 3 vols. demy 8vo, 45s.

Vol. I. HISTORY AND ETHNOLOGY. 15s.

Vol. II. CHURCH AND CULTURE. 15s.

Vol. III. LAND AND PEOPLE. 15s.

"Forty years ago Mr Skene published a small historical work on the Scottish Highlands which has ever since been appealed to as an authority, but which has long been out of print. The promise of this youthful effort is amply fulfilled in the three weighty volumes of his maturer years. As a work of historical research it ought, in our opinion, to take a very high rank."—*Times*.

E. W. Robertson.

Scotland under her Early Kings. A History of the Kingdom to the close of the Thirteenth Century. By E. WILLIAM ROBERTSON. 2 vols. demy 8vo, cloth, 36s.

Historical Essays, in connection with the Land and the Church, etc. By E. WILLIAM ROBERTSON, Author of "Scotland under her Early Kings." 1 vol. demy 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Rev. James B. Johnston.

The Place-Names of Scotland. By the Rev. JAMES B. JOHNSTON, B.D., Falkirk. 1 vol. crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

This book, for which the author has been collecting materials during the last five years, contains an introduction, general and philological, followed by a list of the important place-names in Scotland, with explanations of their meaning, and with their old spellings, each dated so far as known.

Lord Cockburn.

Circuit Journeys. By the late LORD COCKBURN, one of the Judges of the Court of Session. Second Edition, 1 vol. crown 8vo, 6s.

"One of the best books of reminiscences that have appeared."—*Morning Post*.

"Delightful alike for its pleasant landscapes; its sound criticisms on men, law, and books; for its sharp things said in a good-natured way."—*Academy*.

"Valuable for their topographical descriptions; and they form an indirect contribution to the social history of Scotland."—*Scotsman*.

Sir Daniel Wilson.

The Lost Atlantis and other Ethnographic Studies. By Sir DANIEL WILSON, LL.D., F.R.S.E. 1 vol. demy 8vo, 15s.

Contents.—The Lost Atlantis—The Vinland of the Northmen—Trade and Commerce in the Stone Age—Pre-Aryan American Man—The Æsthetic Faculty in Aboriginal Races—The Huron-Iroquois: a Typical Race—Hybridity and Heredity—Relative Racial Brain-Weight and Size.

EDINBURGH: DAVID DOUGLAS.

Two Volumes Demy 8vo, Illustrated, 25s. net.

THE HEREDITARY SHERIFFS OF GALLOWAY

THEIR "FORBEARS" AND FRIENDS
THEIR COURTS, AND CUSTOMS OF THEIR TIMES

WITH NOTES OF THE EARLY HISTORY, ECCLESIASTICAL
LEGENDS, THE BARONAGE AND PLACE
NAMES OF THE PROVINCE

BY THE LATE
SIR ANDREW AGNEW, BART.
OF LOCHNAW



EDINBURGH:
DAVID DOUGLAS, 10 CASTLE STREET
1893


ICELANDIC SAGA, Translated by Sir GEORGE DASENT

Two Volumes Demy 8vo, with Maps and Plans, 28s. net.

THE NJALA SAGA
BURN'T NJAL
FROM THE ICELANDIC OF THE NJAL'S SAGA

BY

SIR GEORGE WEBBE DASENT, D.C.L.



Graysteel

Demy 8vo, Third Edition, 10s. 6d.

POPULAR TALES FROM THE NORSE
WITH AN INTRODUCTORY ESSAY ON THE ORIGIN
AND DIFFUSION OF POPULAR TALES

BY

SIR GEORGE WEBBE DASENT, D.C.L.


EDINBURGH: DAVID DOUGLAS

Demy 4to, Illustrated, 42s. and 84s. net.

THE
HISTORY OF LIDDESDALE
ESKDALE, EWESDALE, WAUCHOPEDALE
AND THE
DEBATEABLE LAND

Part I. from the Twelfth Century to 1530

BY
ROBERT BRUCE ARMSTRONG



CRUKILTON CASTLE


EDINBURGH: DAVID DOUGLAS

One Volume 8vo, Illustrated, 7s. 6d.

SCOTLAND

AS IT WAS AND AS IT IS

BY THE
DUKE OF ARGYLL



ROB ROY'S HOUSE, GLENSHIRA

A HISTORY OF RACES, OF MILITARY EVENTS,
AND OF THE RISE OF COMMERCE

EDINBURGH: DAVID DOUGLAS

Two Volumes 4to, 21s.

ARCHÆOLOGICAL ESSAYS

BY THE LATE

SIR JAMES Y. SIMPSON, BART.

EDITED BY THE LATE

JOHN STUART, LL.D.

AUTHOR OF THE "SCULPTURED STONES OF SCOTLAND"



ANCIENT ORATORY IN THE ISLAND OF INCHCOLM

CONTENTS.

- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| 1. Archæology. | 6. Leprosy and Leper Hospitals. |
| 2. Inchcolm. | 7. Greek Medical Vases. |
| 3. The Cat Stane. | 8. Was the Roman Army provided
with Medical Officers? |
| 4. The Magical Charm-Stones. | 9. Roman Medicine Stamps, etc., etc. |
| 5. Pyramid of Gizeh. | |

EDINBURGH: DAVID DOUGLAS

One Volume Demy 8vo, 5s. net.

DOCUMENTS

RELATING TO THE PROVINCE OF MORAY

EDITED BY

E. DUNBAR DUNBAR

OF GLEN OF ROTHES

FORMERLY CAPTAIN IN THE 21ST (NOW ROYAL SCOTS) FUSILIERS



EDINBURGH: DAVID DOUGLAS

One Volume Demy 8vo, price 14s.


EARLY TRAVELLERS IN SCOTLAND

1295-1689

EDITED BY

P. HUME BROWN

AUTHOR OF 'THE LIFE OF GEORGE BUCHANAN'



EDINBURGH:
DAVID DOUGLAS, 10 CASTLE STREET.

P. Hume Brown.

George Buchanan, Humanist and Reformer: a Biography.

By P. HUME BROWN. Demy 8vo, 12s.

"There is, perhaps, no eminent Scotsman who has stood in better need of an impartial and scholarly biography than George Buchanan; and Mr Hume Brown is to be congratulated on having in the present volume produced a model of its kind."—*Scotsman*.

Tours in Scotland, 1677 and 1681. By THOMAS KIRK and

RALPH THORESEY. Edited by P. HUME BROWN. Demy 8vo, 5s.

A lucky accident having brought these two interesting narratives to light since the "Early Travellers in Scotland" was published, it was thought desirable to reprint them uniform with that book.

Scotland Before 1700. From Contemporary Documents.

Forming a Companion Volume to "Early Travellers in Scotland." By P. HUME BROWN, Author of "The Life of George Buchanan," &c. Demy 8vo, 14s.

Bishop Forbes.

Kalendars of Scottish Saints. With Personal Notices of

those of Alba, etc. By ALEXANDER PENROSE FORBES, D.C.L., Bishop of Brechin. 4to, price £3, 3s. A few copies for sale on large paper, £5, 15s. 6d.

"A truly valuable contribution to the archæology of Scotland."—*Guardian*.

Thomas S. Muir.

Ecclesiological Notes on some of the Islands of Scotland,

with other Papers relating to Ecclesiological Remains on the Scottish Mainland and Islands. By THOMAS S. MUIR, Author of "Characteristics of Church Architecture," etc. Demy 8vo, with numerous Illustrations, 21s.

Sir Samuel Ferguson.

Ogham Inscriptions in Ireland, Wales, and Scotland. By

the late SIR SAMUEL FERGUSON, President of the Royal Irish Academy, Deputy Keeper of the Public Records of Ireland, LL.D., Queen's Counsel, etc. (Being the Rhind Lectures in Archæology for 1884.) 1 vol. demy 8vo, 12s.

Miss Maclagan.

The Hill Forts, Stone Circles, and other Structural Remains


of Ancient Scotland. By C. MACLAGAN, Lady Associate of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland. With Plans and Illustrations. Folio, 31s. 6d.

"We need not enlarge on the few inconsequential speculations which rigid archæologists may find in the present volume. We desire rather to commend it to their careful study, fully assured that not only they, but also the general reader, will be edified by its perusal."—*Scotsman*.

Patrick Dudgeon.

A Short Introduction to the Origin of Surnames. By

PATRICK DUDGEON, Cargen. Small 4to, 3s. 6d.



This book should be returned
the Library on or before the last date
stamped below.

A fine of five cents a day is incurred
by retaining it beyond the specified
time.

Please return promptly.

FEB 22 '58 H